

AN UNDERSTANDING OF RESPONSIBLE INTERPERSONAL EXPERIENCE:
" A COMPARISON OF THE ACTIONS AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS WITH
THE PSYCHOTHERAPIES OF WILLIAM GLASSER AND VIKTOR FRANKL

A
'70
V788

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by
Robert Dean Vinson
" "
June 1970

RECEIVED COPY
JUN 1970
CLAREMONT

This dissertation, written by

Robert Dean Vinson

*under the direction of ~~his~~ Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Frank H. Simpson

Eric L. Titus

Date

May 14, 1970

J. C. H. H. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
The Sources	2
II. JESUS	9
The Kingdom of God	9
In the History of Judaism	9
Jesus' Concept of the Kingdom of God	11
Jesus' Call to Repentance	15
Sin	17
Pride Versus Humility	18
The New Righteousness	21
Faith	25
Trust in the Power of God	26
Faith and Miracle	26
Jesus' Faith in God	29
Love	30
God's Love for Mankind	30
Man's Love of God	32
Man's Love of Neighbor	33
The Meaning of Life	35
Man's Freedom	35
Discipleship	36
The Reward of God	38

	ii
III. A CONTEMPORARY APPROACH TO PSYCHOTHERAPY	43
The Theory of Reality Therapy.	43
Need Fulfillment	43
Involvement	44
Two Basic Needs	45
Responsibility	48
The Teaching of Responsibility	50
A Brief Summary of the Six Differences Between	
Conventional Therapy and Reality Therapy	52
Some Aspects of Logotherapy	55
An Introduction to Viktor Frankl	55
The Will to Meaning.	58
Noögenic Neuroses and Noö-dynamics	60
The Meaning of Life and the Essence	
of Existence	62
The Meaning of Love	64
The Meaning of Suffering	65
The Complimentary Relationship of Logotherapy	
to Reality Therapy	66
IV. A COMPARISON OF JESUS' PERCEPTION OF MAN WITH THE	
VIEWS OF MODERN THERAPY	75
Involvement.	75
The Two Basic Needs	82
Responsibility	86

	iii
The Meaning of Life	92
The Meaning of Love	96
The Meaning of Suffering	100
V. CONCLUSION.	103
The Application and Its Limits	103
The Style	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	106

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

In much of the contemporary literature of the pastoral counseling movement use is being made of quotations from the accounts of the teachings and actions of Jesus. This implies that to some degree the biblical material used is both therapeutically appropriate and religiously relevant to the counseling setting. Unfortunately, this approach has often been used without prior consideration having been given to the critical problems and to the underlying philosophical assumptions involved.

What is needed before one attempts such use of the teachings and actions of Jesus is a clear and comprehensive understanding of the character of responsible interpersonal experience. It is evident that any study of responsible interpersonal experience necessitates at least two things: a generally coherent view of the nature and process of psychotherapy (from an interpersonal rather than an intrapsychic theoretical stance) and an adequate understanding of the nature of man.

Therefore, I intend in this dissertation carefully to examine the Synoptic record, allowing it to speak authentically, wherever it can, concerning Jesus' perception of the nature and purpose of man as he is involved in interpersonal experience. I believe this perception can be approximated by a critical and sensitive study of the Synoptic accounts of the teachings and actions of Jesus.

Following this examination of the Synoptic record, I shall introduce a contemporary model of responsible interpersonal experience as it is understood by two psychiatrists. Using the insights gained from two theories of therapy as models for understanding responsible interpersonal experience, I shall then compare Jesus' perception of interpersonal experience with this modern psychotherapeutic model. The result should give some understanding of the degree to which it is possible to use the teachings and actions of Jesus as a guide to responsible interpersonal experience.

Before turning directly to a study of Jesus' perception of man in the Synoptic materials, we must first acquaint ourselves with the salient features of these sources. My intent in this regard is to make clear my presuppositions as they have come from reliable scholars in the field of New Testament research.

The Sources

It is clear that the three Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, provide the primary witnesses to the "historical Jesus." However, it is of paramount importance that we study these records not as histories of Jesus, but as the documents of a religious tradition. We must therefore realize that we are working with the products (i.e., Synoptic Gospels) of ancient Christian communities. These communities were not concerned with factual material in the sense of modern historiography. Rather they were concerned to meet the needs of the communities concerning the faith. Rudolf Bultmann accurately describes

the nature of the Synoptic Gospels when he writes:

It is perfectly clear that it was not the historical interest that dominated, but the needs of Christian faith and life. One may designate the final motive by which the gospels were produced as the *cultic* (that is, the needs of common worship), if one considers that the high point of Christian life was the gathering of the community for worship, when the figure of Jesus, his teaching as well as his life, was set forth before the eyes of the faithful, and when accordingly the gospels served for public reading.¹

In any critical examination of the Synoptic materials, consideration must be given to those established methods of research. I refer generally to what is often called a historical-critical methodology. More specifically, I am here concerned with the process of "form-criticism," which might more accurately be titled "form-history" as its focus of investigation has to do with the history of the development of the forms of expression which are contained in the gospels. Form-criticism attempts to get back to the oldest layers or strata of tradition and to distinguish this tradition from later redactions.

While a number of recognized New Testament scholars have assigned names to the various forms in the Synoptics, there is at the present time no definitive nomenclature. Therefore, I have chosen briefly to present the work of one scholar as an example.

Martin Dibelius is one of the pioneers in the field of form-critical research of the New Testament. In his book *Jesus*,² he

¹Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Kundsinn, *Form Criticism* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), p. 64.

²Martin Dibelius, *Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949), pp. 23-35.

discusses the various forms as he has identified them. "Jesus' words" or short sayings make up the first such form. Further, "many a story is only a saying fitted out in a narrative frame."³ In such cases, it is the task of the inquirer to separate the saying from the narrative frame.

In this same category of form, Dibelius points out many words of Jesus that have been preserved in the tradition without any framework, historical or otherwise, because they were understandable in themselves.⁴ On the whole these sayings have a distinct character not too unlike the Old Testament prophets.

These short aphorisms, appeals, warnings, and commands are for the most part so vividly and impressively formulated that we have no reason to be surprised if they stuck in the minds of the hearers, later got passed from one person to another in the primitive Christian circle, and came in time to be written down without any essential distortion.⁵

These sayings are understood to have the highest probability of being authentic words of Jesus of any of the forms.

Dibelius' second form is the interconnected utterance, which is generally spoken by Jesus in parallel or repeated form. " . . . the parallel structure of these 'sayings-groups' affords such an aid to the memory . . . that here too a relatively faithful preservation of the text by memory seems quite possible."⁶

The third form includes the longest pieces of tradition in the

³*Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 26.

Synoptics. Dibelius calls these "the *long narrative parables*." These consist of an incident, usually unusual, which is "related in order to exemplify some item of the preaching or to throw light upon it from another sphere."⁷ According to Dibelius, this form contains the best known longer parables (The Prodigal Son, The Laborers in the Vineyard, The Good Samaritan, The Talents, etc.).

In understanding this third form, scholars using the form-critical methodology agree that interpretation has been a chronic problem. The problem is typically manifested in an attempt to overinterpret the narrative parable. As a corrective, Dibelius recommends that the " . . . meaning comes out most clearly when all enframing and explanatory comments are set aside and attention is confined entirely to the text of the narrative."⁸

For Dibelius, these three types constitute the sayings of Jesus. However, he goes on to distinguish three other types of material which are the products, not of the Synoptic authors, but of the existing oral, and eventually written tradition which preceded the writing and compilation of the Gospels themselves.

The first of these types (fourth type overall) is simply designated as "narrative."

Every reader, even of our translated text, can observe how, for example, the 'narratives' contained in Mark chs. 1 to 12, are completely self-contained units whose positions can be interchanged without affecting the picture of Jesus' activity. Only the Passion and Easter stories furnish an exception. . . . All we know is individual incidents, not interconnected events.⁹

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 29.

Involved in this form are two quite different styles of narrative.

It is very instructive to observe both kinds of narration applied to the same theme. In the Gospel of Mark there are two stories of the healing of the blind. In one instance, in Jericho, Mark 10:46-52, it is the faith of the blind man and the command of Jesus that are described; the actual healing is disposed of in a single sentence. In the other instance, in Bethsaida, Mark 8:22-25, attention is focused upon the steps marking the man's gradual recovery. Of the 'religious' aspects--of the patient's faith, for example--and of Jesus' power not a word is said.¹⁰

Dibelius remarks that the second type of narrative is "decidedly secular."¹¹ He bases his decision in this regard upon a comparison of style with approximately contemporary secular healing accounts.

In sharp contrast to the secular narration is the first example given by Dibelius (Mark 10:46-52). This style of narrative with its emphasis upon either the power of Jesus or the faith of the believer combined with that power is understood to have its roots in Christian presuppositions.

As a division in the narrative form, Dibelius calls these "Paradigms." "They are brief enough--and at the same time sufficiently complete in themselves--to be inserted as examples in a proclamation of the Christian faith."¹² Bultmann writes: "Dibelius calls such fragments of tradition 'paradigms,' since he assumes that they served as illustrations in Christian preaching."¹³ Dibelius asserts that they have their origin in the pre-Hellenistic communities from twenty to

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹³ Bultmann and Kundsinn, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

twenty-five years following the crucifixion.

The next form which is distinguished by Dibelius is of a more heterogenous nature. These are to be tested instance by instance for a determination as to their authenticity. Dibelius calls these materials "'Tales' after their manner of narration. . . ."¹⁴ He cites the Gadarene Demoniac and the blind man of Bethsaida as examples of this form.

As a final form, Dibelius points to the uniqueness of the Passion narrative (Mark 14:1-16:8 and parallels).

Here the narrator is led, by the very nature of the matter itself, to strive for a continuous account--all the more so because the Passion narrative has a peculiar place within the Gospel tradition as a whole. . . . It must accordingly be assumed that even in the earliest period there already existed a fixed model of the Passion story, which could be expanded but not departed from, because it had been handed down from the beginning. This general outline--as distinguished from the details--may therefore be viewed as trustworthy. . . .¹⁵

Upon the basis of his research Dibelius concludes that what we have in the Synoptic record are units of older traditional material which have been gathered and arranged by the Gospel authors. This older layer of tradition he maintains is distinguishable from later redactions and for several specific and controllable reasons it is relatively trustworthy.¹⁶

According to the work of this scholar, these are the materials with which we must work, and in order to determine Jesus' perception

¹⁴ Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

of man we must work within the framework of this critical understanding of the Gospels.

One final thing needs to be included before we proceed. This has to do with the relationship of the eschatological and the ethical motifs in the preaching of Jesus. Bultmann writes: "The investigation has shown that both the eschatological and the ethical teaching of Jesus belong equally to the oldest stratum of tradition so that one can hardly call either one of them secondary."¹⁷ If we agree with Bultmann that the oldest layers of tradition contain both ethical and eschatological elements from the preaching of Jesus, then we must ask what relationship do they have to each other; or more precisely, how are they related to the overarching concerns of Jesus?

Bultmann's conclusion is:

We must probably conclude that in the eschatological as in the ethical teaching of Jesus the same fundamental view of God and of man is presupposed. . . . Only the future, which is God's, can bring salvation to man; and this future still faces man, in the present, and requires of him the decision for the world or for God. This is exactly the sense that Jesus' moral demands held. Jesus sets forth neither an individual nor a social ethics; that is, he measured the deeds of men neither according to an ideal conception of human personality nor of human society, but he taught men that the present instant is the moment of decision, in which it is possible to yield up every claim of one's own and submit obediently to the will of God.¹⁸

As we shall see, this call to decision for or against God in the here and now, is a critical key to our task of understanding Jesus' perception of man.

¹⁷ Bultmann and Kundsinn, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

CHAPTER II

JESUS

I. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

In the History of Judaism

Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.'¹

And he went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity among the people.²

Clearly, the coming Kingdom of God is of paramount importance in the teachings of Jesus. A case of great merit might well be made for the position that to understand Jesus at all requires an adequate understanding of what he means when speaking of the Kingdom of God.

Yet, we cannot consider Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom without first having analyzed the background of this theme within the context of the Jewish faith of the first century.

Although the actual phrase, "Kingdom of God," does not appear in the Old Testament, the idea of the Kingdom has a rich heritage in Jewish tradition. In the earliest times, the kingship of Yahweh over Israel, like that of other gods over their respective peoples may be assumed. But the development of this concept of the kingship of Yahweh

¹Mark 1:14-15.

²Matthew 4:23.

is unique. Particularly with the prophets we find that God is not so much the champion of Israel as he is the champion of righteousness.

So far as the actual meaning of the expression translated Kingdom of God . . . is concerned there is no doubt but that the primary and essential reference is to the sovereignty of God conceived of in the most concrete possible manner, i.e., to his *activity* in ruling. . . . Absolutely characteristic, and crucial to a grasp of the real meaning of the expression, is the way in which Ps. 145.11f. uses as parallels to 'thy (God's) Kingdom' the expressions 'thy power' and 'thy mighty deeds.' The Kingdom of God is the power of God expressed in deeds; it is that which God does wherein it becomes evident that he is king. . . . It is quite concretely the activity of God as king.³

Stemming from this foundation of faith in God's activity in the world is the concept of hope which, in the belief of the Jews of Jesus' day will find its complete fulfillment only at the end of time. The vital role played by this view of hope is fundamental to our understanding the Jewish concept of the Kingdom of God. Its peculiar nature is described by Gunther Bornkamm:

Whatever political dreams or indeed whatever fantastic expectations of the destruction or rebirth of the world were bound up with the hopes of the Jews, it is a fundamental part of these hopes that the spirit of resignation which banishes God to a misty place beyond our ideals and which accepts the idea that no change is possible in this world, is totally strange to it. Even in its most distorted form their hope cannot be written off merely as a sudden reversion of feeling due to disappointment in the present, nor as a picture of the future sketched in glowing colours to offset the distress and despair of the present.⁴

With this short introduction serving as a background, we shall now turn to Jesus' use of the phrase Kingdom of God.

³Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 55.

⁴Gunther Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), p. 65.

Jesus' Concept of the Kingdom of God

From the beginning of his ministry, Jesus' concept of the Kingdom of God is strikingly different from that held by the typical religious Jew. Jesus neither confirms or renews the national hopes of his people. Instead, his message comes couched more in terms of the apocalyptic expectations of his day.⁵

Bornkamm points to the element of authority made evident through the directness of Jesus' message concerning the Kingdom of God.

For Jesus calls: the shift in the aeons is here, the kingdom of God is already dawning. Now is the hour of which the prophets told: 'The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up and the poor have good news preached to them' (Mt. xi. 5 cf. Is. xxxv. 5, etc.).⁶

Bornkamm's use of the word "dawning" is pivotal to his analysis of Jesus' concept of the Kingdom. The Kingdom has begun, but only a glimmer of its power and majesty is visible. In one sense we can say that the Kingdom is happening now in Jesus' words and deeds. But if Jesus expected, as scholars maintain, that the Kingdom of God was coming soon in power, how then could he have regarded it as present? To answer this question we turn to a consideration of Jesus' parables about the mustard seed and the leaven.

Rudolf Bultmann regards Luke as a likely prospect for giving us the closest to the original form in both parables (he prefers to

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 67.

consider them under the heading "similitudes"): ⁷

He said therefore, 'What is the kingdom of God like? And to what shall I compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his garden; and it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the air made nests in its branches.'

And again he said, 'To what shall I compare the kingdom of God? It is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.' (Luke 13:18-21)

The point of the parables seems evident. They speak of the Kingdom as appearing to be insignificant, yet in reality, being all important for everything that is around them. The fact that the mustard seed is tiny in no way detracts from the full grown tree. The invisibility of the yeast fails to hamper the rising of the bread when it is baking. Likewise, the presence of the Kingdom in Jesus' ministry is not to be judged by his power or lack of it. ⁸

The urgency of the message of Jesus is best explained by this aspect of the Kingdom. It is not because his ethic is the ethic that is to be lived in the perfect Kingdom . . . The teaching is hard because to people living in this world Jesus said: 'This is the nature of God, and his will is that you should be his true sons.'

⁷Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 172. (Note: p. 200; Bultmann considers the original *sitz im leben* of both similitudes unrecoverable. He doubts a genuine connection between the introductory questions and the sayings themselves. Martin Dibelius understands them to refer to the specific preaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God, i.e., Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 68).

⁸Ernest Cadman Colwell, *An Approach to the Teachings of Jesus* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1957), p. 112.

Here is the granite core of Jesus' teaching. The difficulty of the individual sayings derives from this bare, unqualified proclamation of God's will. . . . Jesus provides no formula of accommodation to dilute the divine will! 'Be ruled by God!' and he meant 'now'!⁹

While there is a sense in which we may speak of the Kingdom of God both as present and as future, it would be foolish to attempt to separate them. The truth is that Jesus' sayings about the Kingdom, cannot be understood either in the sense of applying only to the present or to the future. Bornkamm writes: "The present dawn of the Kingdom of God is always spoken of so as to show that the present reveals the future as salvation and judgment, and therefore does not anticipate it."¹⁰ The important thing to remember is that the future of God is salvation for the man of faith and that same future is judgment for the man who does not accept God's activity in present history.¹¹

The matter of time is also of great significance for understanding Jesus' teachings concerning the Kingdom. Generally, we may say that first-century Judaism saw time as a two-dimensional event. The present evil age forms the first dimension and the future good age where God will reign in power is the second dimension. New Testament scholarship since Schweitzer, has been concerned with the genuineness of the eschatological elements in Jesus' teaching. There is no longer any substantial reason for our doubting that Jesus shared with his contemporaries the view that the world was fast rushing toward its final end. It was therefore natural for his followers to ask how they

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 92. ¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 93.

might be able to determine when the time was at hand. At this point the followers broke with the mind of Jesus. His opposition to such apocalyptic methods as they obviously envisioned is altogether clear. This is evident in the sayings regarding the sign of the end (Mark 8:12, Matthew 12:40 and Luke 11:29-30). Mark records Jesus as saying simply that no sign shall be given. Matthew and Luke record the reference to the "sign of Jonah."

Just as Jonah became a sign for the inhabitants of Nineveh, so *Jesus himself* is the sign of God's Kingdom. . . . Jonah brought the people of Nineveh none of those predicted apocalyptic signs, but rather he himself, his call to repentance was the one and only signal that was given them.¹²

Another insight into this matter of watching for the end of the world is given us by Jesus' parable of the unjust steward (Luke 16:1-8). Here we have a picture of a man who knows he has only one last chance to succeed in a hostile setting. If we disregard verse 8, we have an interesting and powerful parable.¹³ Concerning a translation into modern idiom of this same parable, Perrin writes:

The point of the story is that we have here a man in crisis. True, he is a peculiarly disreputable man . . . , but he is a man of decision: faced with a crisis, he acted decisively. Again, we are back to the point of the crisis of the men confronted by Jesus, his ministry and proclamation, and the necessity for decision *now*.¹⁴

¹²Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

¹³Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 175f. Bultmann definitely considers the application in verse 8 to be secondary.

¹⁴Perrin, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

If Perrin is right in his interpretation of this parable, it is illustrative of Jesus' call for repentance.

Jesus' Call to Repentance

This connection between the coming of the Kingdom of God and Jesus' call to repentance is not accidental. The Kingdom is both the source of the call and the driving force behind its urgency.

Although the most often remembered statement by Jesus regarding repentance (Mark 1:15) is likely a Christian summary, it expresses something which is evident in the ministry of Jesus. Repentance is no longer simply a demand placed upon men from God, it now becomes a possibility for new life. "Jesus' message here comes very close to John the Baptist's. . . . For both of them, repentance ceases to be an exercise of piety by means of which the righteous man can show himself to be such."¹⁵ The demand for repentance is not lessened, just the opposite: the meaning for the truly repentent and the outcome are decisively different. This call and its role in an appropriate response to the Kingdom of God, are perhaps best illustrated by Jesus' parable about the pearl of great price.

Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant in search of fine pearls, who, on finding one pearl of great value went and sold all that he had and bought it.¹⁶

¹⁵Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹⁶Matthew 13:45. Note: Dibelius (*op. cit.*, p. 65) points to the identity of the expressions, Kingdom of heaven and Kingdom of God.

From this we can see that repentance for Jesus means to lay hold of the salvation which is already at hand, and to be willing to give up all other goals which might be in competition with the Kingdom. There is also here an important change pointed out by Bornkamm:

Salvation and repentance have, however, changed places. While to the Jewish ways of thinking repentance is the first thing, the condition which affords the sinner the hope of grace, it is now the case that repentance comes by means of grace.¹⁷

A natural concomitant of this reversal of repentance and grace is that repentance now means the humbling of oneself before God. We shall consider this in further detail later in this chapter when we explicate the nature of the new righteousness.

Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them. For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished.¹⁸

Bultmann is, in all probability correct in ascribing this text to the debates of the primitive church.¹⁹ Even so, we have in this tradition an accurate picture of Jesus' view of the Old Testament law.

Recognizing that Jesus had no intention of abolishing the law, and adequately apprehending the relationship between his position and the law are two quite different things. Several times throughout the

¹⁷Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

¹⁸Matthew 5:17-18.

¹⁹Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

Gospels we catch glimpses of Jesus behaving according to rabbinical procedure. Certainly the numerous times he is addressed as "Rabbi" are not accidental. Bornkamm notes that on one occasion the Pharisees come and warn Jesus that he is being plotted against by Herod. And at no time does Jesus ever repudiate communion with either scribes or Pharisees.²⁰

Perhaps the most significant thing for our consideration, however, is the open conflict between Jesus and the traditional interpreters of the law. It is possible that only at a later time did the antagonism of the Pharisees and scribes at Jesus' attitude toward the law develop into their antagonism toward him. However, we must constantly be on guard at this point. *"There is an active tendency seeking always to present the opponents of Jesus as Scribes and Pharisees."*²¹

II. SIN

Jesus' view of sin cannot be understood apart from this relationship to the Mosaic law. It is accurate to say that in first-century Judaism sin is best understood as a failure to meet the standard of righteousness found in the law. The common Gospel reference to "'sinners' . . . is a term referring to the so-called 'people of the land' who had neither time nor inclination to keep the law."²²

It was to these people that Jesus addressed himself. And, it was only because he did not share the strict legalistic interpretation

²⁰Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, pp. 96f. ²¹Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

²²Eric Lane Titus, *Essentials of New Testament Study* (New York: Ronald Press, 1958), p. 73.

of the law according to what we commonly consider the position of the Pharisees that he was able to associate with sinners and tax-collectors. Jesus was concerned much more with what came out of a man than with what went in (Mark 7:15). This saying leads one to the realization that "for Jesus . . . the will of God is present in such immediate fashion that the letter of the law may be gauged by it. . . ." ²³

Pride versus Humility

The heart of Jesus' teachings regarding sin is clearly to be found connected to the problem of pride. This is not pride in a general sense (i. e., conceit). Rather, it is nearly always specifically religious pride. In these sayings and traditions of Jesus there is the implicit assumption that when one is proud of himself he cannot truly worship God.

We shall next examine some of these sayings concerning sin in order to gain insight into the approach of Jesus to this problem. We may begin with the well-known paradigm of the rich young ruler. However, our concern here is with only a small portion of this paradigm.

"And Jesus said to him, 'Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.'" ²⁴ Jesus' personal humility is striking in its force. This by itself seems to be sufficient reason for our regarding this saying as genuine. The point of Jesus' response is clear: God alone is good; no other is even to be considered in the same category.

²³ Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 100. ²⁴ Mark 10:18.

This leads to the conclusion that the source of Jesus' humility is his faith in and response to God. Colwell has written:

It is not unreal to say that Jesus' own response to God was a devotion so complete that he did not have time to worry about making clear to men what Jesus' role was, or what Jesus' title should be, or just what Jesus thought about himself. The supreme tribute to Jesus' own humility is that no one can answer the question, 'What did Jesus think of himself?'²⁵

Perhaps the discourse concerning Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23:2-12 is the one that most frequently comes to mind when one thinks of this matter of religious pride. In view of some inherent problems involved in a critical analysis of this text it should be dealt with in more detail.

The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; so practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach, but do not practice. They bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger. They do all their deeds to be seen by men; for they make their phylacteries broad and their fringes long, and they love the place of honor at feasts and the best seats in the synagogues, and salutations in the market places, and being called rabbi by men. But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren. And call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven. Neither be called masters, for you have one master, the Christ. He who is the greatest among you shall be your servant; whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted.²⁶

The following diagram shows clearly the composite nature of this text. It also points to the difficulty of determining which portions are authentically the words of Jesus. The consensus of scholarship is that there is to be found in this tradition an authentic kernel going back to the historical Jesus.

²⁵Colwell, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

²⁶Matthew 23:2-12.

FORM CRITICISM DIAGRAM

Speaker	Vs.	
1. Evangelist	1	Editorial preparation
2. Jesus	2	Introduction
3. Jesus (or community	3-7	Teaching and Polemic
4. Jesus	8,9	Teaching
5. Community		Testimony
6. Community (possibly Jesus)	11	Logion
7.	12	Logion

Bornkamm in referring to this text makes it clear that he considers the major portion (beginning with verse 2) genuinely Jesus.²⁷

Bultmann, by contrast, believes that it is somewhat possible for verses 8-10 to be genuine, but he doubts even this.²⁸

We obviously cannot determine the *sitz im leben* of the individual units of tradition beyond certain negative conclusions. Unit (1) is clearly the work of the evangelist. Unit (5) with its reference to Christ is clearly the work of the post-Easter church. Unit (7) is a popular final logion and is to be found in at least two other places (i.e., Luke 14:11 and 18:14b). While this might lead us to assume its authentic nature, we must be careful, for similar passages are popular in contemporary Jewish literature.²⁹

²⁷Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 96. ²⁸Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

²⁹Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 107.

Granting the existence of these significant problems with the text, it is still startling how this invective toward the outward show of religious piety strikes the reader. In contrasting the preaching of the Pharisees with that of Jesus, Dibelius writes:

A kind of preaching that is concerned so exclusively with what is coming in the future must stand in sharpest contrast to a system that is built on a give-and-take between God and men in the present. To be sure, . . . the Pharisees, also 'believed' in the coming Messiah and his Kingdom, but they were not eager for him, for they were satisfied with the present.³⁰

Given this situation, we are forced to the conclusion that Jesus was wholly opposed to religious pride on two accounts. First, it erected a barrier between man and God. Second, it made virtually impossible true fellowship and the sharing of selves among men.

The New Righteousness

It is to this same point that the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector speaks (Luke 18:9-14). But this parable also leads to a consideration of the new righteousness. Therefore, we need to examine it in some detail.

And he also told this parable to some who trusted in themselves, because they were righteous and despised the rest. Two men went up to the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a tax collector. The Pharisee, standing to himself was praying these things; 'God, I thank you that I am not as the rest of men; greedy, swindlers, adulterers, nor even as this tax collector. I fast twice a week, I tithe all things, as much as I gain.' But the tax collector, standing far away, would not even lift up his eyes to heaven but was striking his breast saying, 'God be

³⁰ Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

merciful to me a sinner.' I say to you, this one went down to his house justified rather than the other. Everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted.³¹

If we disregard the editorial preparation in verse nine and the final logion in verse fourteen, we then have pure narrative material. Jeremias locates this parable in the early Palestinian tradition and considers it to be authentically the words of Jesus.³² However, it is doubtful that Luke was aware of the early Palestinian origin of this tradition. If so, he would have wanted to locate the parable in another place (e.g. sometime during the journey through Samaria to Jerusalem). This minor problem is raised by Luke's consistent, but often obvious, attempt to weave the fragments of his sources into a continuous historical framework.

In analyzing the meaning of the parable, we may be assured that it is addressed to the Pharisees, and that "their main object is not the presentation of the Gospel, but defence and vindication of the Gospel; they are controversial weapons against the critics and foes of the Gospel."³³

Although there is a strong element of polemic against self-righteous religious pride in this parable this is not its only point.

³¹Luke 18:9-14. Translation is my own and is taken from Albert Huck, *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* (New York: American Bible Society, 1957), p. 142.

³²Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 100.

Just as central to the truth of the parable as it understands itself is an explanation of God's method of measuring righteousness. God gives grace to those who are sincere within themselves. Man apart from God (represented by the Pharisee's prayer), seeks for righteousness outside himself, by his works. Jesus is saying that God is concerned about motivation at least as much as he is concerned with the performance of correct deeds.

This is the new righteousness, and it is measured by God. It stands in sharp contrast to the righteousness of the Pharisees which is measured by man.

Bornkamm in his discussion on the new righteousness states that this righteousness has two fronts which oppose each other. The first is found in fulfilling rather than abolishing the law (Matthew 5:17). The second is contained in the saying: "For I tell you unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 5:20).³⁴ Bornkamm believes that the two sayings, and the antitheses; "You have heard that it was said to the men of old . . . But I say to you" (Matthew 5:21-48), together with the beatitudes form the core for a fundamentally new message. This new message, he believes, is directed on two fronts which are relevant for all time.³⁵

The first front is found in Jesus' saying concerning his role as fulfilling the law. Bornkamm believes that Jesus is here summarizing

³⁴Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 100. ³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 101.

his disapproval of all fanatical disregard for the authority of the law. "If we ask for the reason . . . the answer can only be: because for Jesus the true future does not demand the sacrifice of man."³⁶ By this he means that God cannot be exchanged for anything else, and that man is responsible for his own approval and acceptance of God and God's law.³⁷

The second front for Bornkamm is to be found in the quality which might be described as the second mile.

Jesus' call to unqualified truthfulness, and therefore to the renunciation of the right of retaliation even where one has received injustice, and also his commandment not to resist evil; and finally his call to a love which embraces not only the neighbor but also the enemy (Mt. v. 21-48). This is the righteousness which exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, without which no one may enter the kingdom of God (Mt. v. 20).³⁸

The antitheses (Matthew 5:21-48) give us some insight into the character of this new righteousness also. These sayings grow out of the realization that the law has become separated from God and now leads man away from rather than towards God.³⁹

So it can readily be seen that the new righteousness transcends the law in that it fulfills the original purpose of the law, i.e., to lead a man to God.

One of the interesting aspects of this new righteousness is that it led or allowed⁴⁰ Jesus to associate with the *am haaretz* (i.e., the

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 103.

³⁷*Ibid.*

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁴⁰Note: No systematic progression in the thought of Jesus from the new righteousness to the acceptance of *am haaretz* into the Kingdom

people of the land). Jesus, because the new righteousness had supplanted the role which had formerly belonged to the law, is now quite at ease in proclaiming a variety of sinners, prostitutes and even tax-collectors "justified" (Luke 18:14) before God and as worthy of the Kingdom of God as any other man or woman. Perrin rightly perceives this action on the part of Jesus as necessary for explaining sensibly, the fact of the cross.⁴¹

Finally in this regard, we need to consider Jesus' teachings concerning "the last things." Bornkamm, using the material of the Sermon on the Mount, concludes that Jesus' eschatology is a concealed one. "This means that the claims of Jesus carry in themselves 'the last things,' without having to borrow validity and urgency from the blaze of the fire in apocalyptic scenes."⁴²

III. FAITH

"Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the Gospel.'"⁴³

We have already discussed both the kingdom and the demand for

of God is implied. I am aware of the unsystematic nature of Jesus' teachings and therefore wary of the concomitant danger involved in establishing logical cause and effect relationships.

⁴¹Perrin, *op. cit.*, pp. 102ff.

⁴²Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁴³Mark 1:14-15.

repentance; we turn next to the matter of faith. Here we must bear in mind the difficulty of the tradition. Whereas many statements concerning faith appear on the lips of Jesus, the number of these sayings that can be reasonably authenticated is considerably less. However, we are resting upon safe ground when we understand that faith is often an implicit understanding rather than an explicit teaching.

Trust in the Power of God

The primary idea for us is that faith for Jesus is always understood as trust in the power of God. Rarely do we find in the Synoptics the sort of trust which is generally in the goodness of God. Likewise, the quality of trust in Jesus' understanding is in no way comparable to a submission to fate which might be found in stoicism.

The emphasis upon faith in the power of God is typically specific in its focus. In the tradition it is most often connected with the coming Kingdom of God. Faith for Jesus also seems to be heightened by an acutely sensitive awareness of the presence of God in the events of human history.

Faith and Miracle

Due to the nature of the tradition we must consider the relation of faith to miracle. While it is true that for the early church the miracle stories become testimony to Jesus as the Christ, it is just as true that the miracles are not performed to bring persons to faith. This is an exceedingly difficult area of the tradition and responsible

scholars are in agreement as to the high incidence of legendary materials contained here.

Jn. 20^{30f.} shows clearly as Dibelius (*Formgeschichte*, p. 18.2) quite rightly points out, that it is of the very essence of the gospel to contain miracle stories. The meaning and form of the miracle stories in the Synoptics bear this out entirely. They are not told just as remarkable occurrences, but as miracles of Jesus. . . . The miracles are, as it were, something apart from his individual will, an automatic functioning.⁴⁴

Thus we can see that while faith and miracle are quite definitely connected the growth of the Gospel tradition is responsible for the role of miracle becoming a testimony to Jesus. But for Jesus, there is a very concrete and specific sense in which the believer trusts in the power of God to act decisively at and beyond the point where human possibilities are exhausted.

There is built into the tradition an interesting example of the human limits of faith (Mark 9:20-24). The healing of the boy takes place according to Mark only following an exchange between Jesus and the father. There is the statement: "All things are possible to him who believes," and then comes the paradoxical response of the father, "I believe; help my unbelief!" Bornkamm writes: "--here the petitioner has indeed exceeded his own ability, and confesses a faith greater than he really has. In this paradox of faith and unbelief, as the story points out, faith becomes true and capable of receiving the miracle of God."⁴⁵

⁴⁴Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 218f.

⁴⁵Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

Perrin points to some recent trends in form-critical scholarship which are undertaking a reexamination of the miracle stories and most especially the healing or exorcism accounts. He argues for the general authenticity of a healing element in the historical ministry of Jesus.

Another factor entering into the discussion at this point is the increasing willingness of critical scholars to accept the premise that Jesus did, in fact, 'cast out demons' in a way considered remarkable by his contemporaries. The evidence for this is strong. We have the testimony of the Jewish sources; the fact that such stories occur in all strata of the tradition, including the two earliest, Mark and Q (criterion of multiple attestation); and the authentic Kingdom-sayings related to exorcisms, especially Matt. 12.28 par.⁴⁶

Schweitzer in the early 1900's showed the folly of attempting to diagnose the diseases involved in the exorcism accounts.⁴⁷ The radically different world-view of first-century Judaism alone would make this feat impossible.

Bornkamm has given us an excellent discussion on the relation of prayer to faith.⁴⁸ Particularly important for our understanding is the relationship between faith and repetitive prayer. This, says Bornkamm " . . . is an expression both of presumption and anxiety. It presumes to wear God down (*fatigare deos*), and at the same time has the anxious thought that God must be briefed as to the need of those who pray."⁴⁹

⁴⁶Perrin, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

⁴⁷Albert Schweitzer, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1948).

⁴⁸Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-137.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*

The quality of human anxiety is decisive for understanding Jesus' perception of man without faith. In response to anxiety, the confidence displayed by Jesus stands in sharp contrast. This confidence has, both as its source and object the certain coming of the Kingdom of God. It is illustrated by two parables in the Lucan tradition (the parable of the Unjust Judge, Luke 18:2-8; and the parable of the Friend asking for help by night, Luke 11:5-8). The point of both parables is precisely the same. If the Judge will heed the widow's case and if the friend who is awakened at such a ridiculous hour will fulfill the request for bread, how much more will God fulfill those requests that we make to him! God knows and responds to the cry of the needy and he comes to help. Both of the parables are intended to give the disciples confidence in the certain fact of God's presence. In both the same trust is evident; we hear Jesus saying: Take God seriously! He is steadfast in his concern and nothing is more certain than his mercy for his own.

Jesus' Faith in God

The so-called "contrast parables" (i.e., the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, the Sower, and the Patient Husbandman) along with the two parables we have just considered, from what Jeremias calls "the great assurance."⁵⁰ Together these six parables provide us with primary sources for understanding Jesus' faith in God.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 146ff.

⁵¹ Cf. pp. 11 and 12 for a short discussion on the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven.

It is the faith of Jesus in the power of God and his resolute confidence that the Kingdom is coming which provides the basis for his speaking with authority. Although we have spoken briefly about this earlier, further clarification is required. The Synoptics speak concerning the nature of Jesus' authority (Mark 1:22, Matthew 7:28-29, Luke 4:32). This authority of Jesus takes on the quality of a sanction for his followers. This sanction is essential (not merely formal) and provides to Jesus' hearers the ultimate reason for following him.

Jesus appeals to a variety of motives. These are typically related to the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom is at hand; and those who want a place in it, must conform to God's demands. In contrast to the formal sanctions the essential sanction lies deeper. The ultimate source is the fact that God loves men concretely, and the most genuinely human response to that love is to respond in kind.

IV. LOVE

This brings us to our next consideration; namely the role of love in the teachings of Jesus. We have already touched upon this aspect of Jesus' teachings, albeit implicitly. What we have now to do is make it explicit.

God's Love for Mankind

It is true that nowhere in the Synoptic record do we find Jesus specifically saying that God loves. However, I am convinced that love was such a part of his own faith and such a part of the common belief

of the people that a discourse on the subject would have been quite unnecessary. In fact as we have already seen, there are numerous cases where a subject was a vital part of Jesus' faith and teaching. But where he could safely assume their sharing this faith he would have no reason to speak.

The common heritage of the Old Testament speaks throughout of God's love for Israel. By some peculiar turn of events modern Christians often overlook the pervading character of God's love as it is revealed in his dealings with the Hebrews. We often are prone to forget the fact that the primary historic religious event for any Jew (either ancient or modern) is the Exodus. Through the Exodus, God is seen not as a righteous judge or angry spirit, rather he is the Lord God of History who delivered his people out of the land of Egypt.⁵² So we can see that for the average Jew of Jesus' time, understanding God as a God of love was only natural.

In considering the nature of God's love for man, we must not allow ourselves to think of this love as passive concern. God is active in history--his Kingdom is coming and the message of Jesus is repentance in the here and now. This call to repentance stands in creative tension with God's love for men. We may say that it is the nature of God to judge with mercy; but we can never resolve the tension that exists between these two elements in the relationship of God to man.

⁵²Rolf Knierim, private lecture. School of Theology at Claremont.

Man's Love of God

Man's response to this two pronged proclamation (i.e., you are accepted and loved by God, and you are called to repent of the pride and self-concern that is in you) can only be adequately conveyed by dealing with Jesus' teaching concerning the great commandment (Matthew 22:37-39; Mark 12:29-31; Luke 10:27).

The evidence for discarding each of the settings for this saying is strong. Therefore, I want only to consider the teaching itself, not the editorial introductions or the final logia. The placing of the saying upon the lips of the lawyer in Luke is not of major importance for our purposes; the fact that Jesus says he is right in his answer to the greatest commandment of the law is important.

And the greatest commandment is a summary of the law. It combines a portion of the *Shema* (Deut. 6:5) with a saying of the Lord given to Moses in Leviticus 19:18. Such summaries of Mosaic law are common in the Old Testament and it is apparent that this was a favorite Jewish method of teaching.⁵³

The first part of the commandment simply calls man to love God unconditionally. But it must be remembered that this commandment is responsive to God's initiating love. Man does not love God on the basis of some emotion or tendency which is only generally located in the nature of his being. Dibelius writes:

⁵³ Sherman E. Johnson, "Saint Matthew: Introduction and Exegesis" in *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 523.

The source of the love that Jesus demands is God's love, revealed in Jesus' message and Jesus' life in so far as both are signs of the divine Kingdom: God's love directed toward the unworthy--for all are unworthy, the good and the bad.⁵⁴

Man's Love of Neighbor

A natural question arises when considering the relationship between love of God and love of neighbor. Bornkamm explains the meaning of this double commandment to love as follows:

Clearly the inseparable unity into which Jesus brings them has its reason and meaning not in the similarity of those towards whom this love is directed, but in the nature of this love itself. It is in Jesus' own words the renunciation of self-love, the willingness for and the act of surrender there where you actually are, or, which is the same, where your neighbour is, who is waiting for you. In this way and no other God's call comes to us, and in this way the love of God and the love of neighbour become one.⁵⁵

It is obvious that love of God for Jesus never meant anything remotely approximating the kind of "life-style"⁵⁶ which is commonly associated with the monastic orders. Rather, the commandment of love clearly calls men to a life-affirming pattern of living in relationship with his neighbor.

But who is a neighbor? Obviously it is no accident that Luke places the parable of the Good Samaritan immediately after the command-

⁵⁴Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁵⁵Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁵⁶"Life-style" is a term coined by the psychoanalyst Alfred Adler. It refers to a primary and pervasive way or style of coping with life. Although in Adlerian theory it normally refers specifically as a way of compensating for feelings of inferiority, I do not necessarily intend such an inference here.

ment to love (Luke 10:29-37). Concerning the introduction to the parable Jeremias writes:

The usual view that the introductory verses 25-28 are simply a parallel to the question about the greatest commandment . . . has recently been challenged on weighty grounds. In fact, the only connection is the double command to love; all the rest is completely different, and it is quite probable that Jesus often uttered so important a thought as that contained in the double command.⁵⁷

Assuming the encounter between the scribe and Jesus to be authentic, what does this mean for our understanding the parable? What is important is that we see the scribe as asking Jesus for some indication of the limits of his responsibility to love his neighbor. Jeremias shows that the argument against the priest and Levite touching the man on the basis of Levitical grounds (they assumed him to be dead) is weak.⁵⁸ The implication is clear that the religious men were commanded by the law they professed to love this man and they failed to love.

But no Jew would have expected the parable to end as it did! For a Samaritan to fulfill the commandment to love would have been unthinkable. Jesus intentionally chose an extreme example. By comparing the selfishness of the priest and the Levite with the self-giving love of the hated Samaritan, Jesus shows that the commandment of love knows no limit, save the need of the suffering one. Jesus, in the parable says to the scribe: "Think of the sufferer, put yourself in

⁵⁷Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 202. Note: Jeremias is following the work of T. W. Manson (*The Sayings of Jesus* [London: SCM Press, 1949]) in his argument against the priest and Levite following Levitical law.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 203f.

his place, consider who needs help from me?"⁵⁹

The full force of the parable is not felt until we relate it to the message of Jesus concerning God's forgiveness. No human being is beyond the bounds of God's mercy. The command to love calls a man to be ready at a moment's notice to give his life for another's need, irrespective of the worthiness of the other person.

The parable ends with an imperative (Luke 10:37). This in all probability is part of church tradition later attributed to Jesus.⁶⁰ Still, even without being explicit; "Go and do likewise" is the only logical conclusion to the parable. This imperative makes clear the unavoidable nature of this command for all men.

The command to love is never based upon a universal idea or upon an enlightened view of the national and religious questions arising in the relationships of Jews to Samaritans. As Bornkamm says: "The ground of his command of love is simply because it is what God wills and what God does."⁶¹

V. THE MEANING OF LIFE

Man's Freedom

Although Jesus never specifically speaks on the subject of freedom, it would be impossible to understand his teachings or even his

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 205.

⁶⁰Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁶¹Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

ministry apart from the assertion of the freedom of man.

The essence of the Law as it is understood by Jesus is that observance of it should be a liberating, exhilarating experience. Instead of this, in his own time Jesus finds that men are oppressed by the Law. The faith of Israel becomes a burden to all who practice it. To follow Jesus means to gain freedom from such burdens.

Freedom, thus understood, can never exist in isolation. It is always tied clearly to a relationship with God. Man can choose for or against God, but he can never avoid the consequences of his choice. If a man repudiates the Kingdom of God, he may well expect divine judgment. The alternative to judgment is discipleship.

Discipleship

There is a practice in our own time of using the word "disciple" to refer to the twelve personally selected by Jesus to help him fulfill his ministry. Originally the term had a much wider application. However, we should not make the mistake of thinking that the term is meant to designate any who heard Jesus' words and moved along with the crowds that followed him.

Bornkamm writes:

Discipleship means decision, Jesus' decision as regards certain individuals, but then it means no less their own decision to follow him. It consists, in actual fact, in the determination to abandon everything and, in the first instance quite literally, to follow Jesus from place to place, and to accept the fate of the wanderer with all its privations.⁶²

⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 146.

Discipleship demands a serious decision to put the will of God and the needs of his Kingdom above all else! It is a call to extreme focusing of human resources in response to God. And it is only in response to God's call that one becomes a disciple. This call is not extended to everyone. "Some he leaves within their own circle, without taking them from their home, their work, their family. He does not blame them for any lack of determination . . . nor exclude them from the Kingdom of God."⁶³ The disciples therefore, are to be distinguished from the smaller group of Jesus' intimate followers.

It is not usually possible for us to tell which of the teachings of Jesus were addressed to the twelve and which might have been intended to refer to a larger number of Jesus' followers. Bornkamm says the essential demand is the same for all persons: repent in the light of the coming Kingdom of God.⁶⁴ This is the sole reason for Jesus' calling men to follow him. Following in the strict sense of the way of the Master is addressed only to the twelve.⁶⁵ To these the command is addressed: "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead."⁶⁶

The task of the disciples is perhaps best expressed in the words of the calling of Simon and Andrew: "Follow me and I will make you become fishers of men."⁶⁷ Unquestionably, this simply means the men

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*

⁶⁵Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁶⁶Matthew 8:22.

⁶⁷Mark 1:17. Note: Parallel in Luke 5:10 is addressed to James and John. The importance of the statement lies not in who is called but who calls and why.

are called to catch others for the Kingdom of God. They are called out to proclaim the imminent inexorable coming Kingdom; "to prove its healing powers, which are already active in the present. . . . It is therefore the first task of the disciples to bring peace and salvation. . . ." ⁶⁸

The twelve disciples are best understood both historically and symbolically. While the tradition of twelve select men cannot be simply assumed, neither can we disregard the historical roots of an intimate group of followers of Jesus. Otherwise, how can we understand the persistence of the tradition of Judas, even though this fact must surely have been a problem for the early church. ⁶⁹ But this same church sensed in the group that followed Jesus, a religious covenant of the deepest spiritual level, not unlike the covenant between God and the twelve tribes of Israel.

The Reward of God

The meaning of life as portrayed in the Synoptic record cannot be grasped apart from an honest acceptance of God's reward. Such honest acceptance must include the facing of God's judgment upon all men.

Furthermore, it is this divine judgment which gives character or value to man's action. This is not to say that actions may not have an intrinsic value, but only to indicate that God's judgment is concrete and specific upon the acts of men.

⁶⁸Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 149. ⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 150.

When God's judgment is met, there grows a trusting, intimate relationship between a man and God. This is evident from a careful reading of the Parable of the Talents (Matthew 25:14-30). When the master left for his journey, his servants knew what he would do with the talents; he would invest them and make them produce profit. Two of his servants followed the spirit of his concern. The third servant followed the minimum requirement of the law.

By this Jesus is saying that the spirit of God's will is more demanding than the Law. But more importantly, that when man follows the spirit of God's will, he is rewarded with a new and trusting relationship to God, e.g., "well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, I will set you over much; enter into the joy of your master" (Matthew 25:21).

In understanding the relationship between the reward of God and the meaning of a man's life, the essential question must be: "Have you done the will of God?"

The will of God may further be considered within the context of the parable of the Last Judgment (Matthew 25:31-46). It is no accident that this parable follows immediately the parable of the Talents. Both parables speak to men concerning God's reward, his judgment, and his will.

While it is likely that the parable of the Last Judgment contains some late materials, it is also true that it expresses the early church's sense of the meaning of life in relation to God.

Jeremias goes so far as to quote T. W. Manson, who says: The

parable contains "features of such startling originality that it is difficult to credit them to anyone but the master himself."⁷⁰

The will of God, as revealed in the parable, is perhaps best described by the word ἀγάπη. This is a term for love which was, in all probability, borrowed from pagan sources and "Christianized" by the earliest Christian community.

Essentially, ἀγάπη means Christian love in a high moral and ethical sense. Anders Nygren has given the classical treatment of the subject of *Agape* in relationship to *Eros*. He writes:

In the Gospels, Agape and fellowship with God belong inseparably together, so that each implies the other. We cannot speak of love without speaking of fellowship with God, nor of fellowship with God without speaking of love.⁷¹

The character of ἀγάπη which seems most relevant to the parable of the Last Judgment is that it is in no way a self-seeking love. ἀγάπη does not calculate for its own selfish benefit.

According to this parable, God's reward⁷² comes only when acts of love are demonstrated purely in response to human need. This is ἀγάπη made manifest. Bornkamm writes:

⁷⁰Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 209. The quotation is from Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

⁷¹Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), p. 146.

⁷²Note: There is a reference in vs. 32 to "all nations." In all probability this is intended to mean those who do not know the God of Israel. Oxford Annotated Edition, *The Holy Bible*, Revised Standard Version. From the commentary on Matthew 25:31-46, p. 1206.

We remember here once again the description of the judgment of the world in Matthew xxv. 31ff., where the blessed of the Father can answer the judge of the world only with surprise, almost with a sense of self-accusation, as much as to say: You are mistaken! We did not recognise or mean you at all, but really only the person in need, and our deeds do not deserve to be mentioned now at the hour of judgment. The cursed on the other hand, excuse themselves with the same answer: had we known what was at stake in our ordinary, everyday meetings, we would surely not have failed. And so these are rewarded just because they did not love for the sake of a reward, and the others are rejected because without the prospect of reward or punishment they could not be moved to do a deed of love.⁷³

As it is true that the love of man for his fellow man cannot be given as barter in trade for divine blessing, so it is likewise true that the nature of God's love is complete ἀγάπη. The parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matthew 20:1-16) shows how completely this is the case. The verbal contract between the householder and the laborers is clearly stated, a fact which shows its importance. At the conclusion of the parable, the scale of wages is shown to be important only in demonstrating something which is far more important, namely that God is sovereign and that his sovereignty is reflected in his goodness.

This then is what constitutes God's kingship (xx.1): God's mercy knows no limits. God's heart is here revealed. But also the heart of man . . . who cannot rejoice in God's grace --who, like the older brother in the parable of the prodigal son, can only grumble against that goodness which is being bestowed upon the brother returned home.⁷⁴

With Jesus we can see the idea of divine reward receiving a new meaning. Reward is now totally separated from the good deeds and claims of man; it has become an expression of the grace and mercy of

⁷³ Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

God. Man is now called to obey; to stand in faith; to love and do good, expecting nothing in return, and to depend upon the inexorable coming of God's Kingdom.

CHAPTER III

A CONTEMPORARY APPROACH TO PSYCHOTHERAPY

I. THE THEORY OF REALITY THERAPY

Dr. William Glasser is a psychiatrist in private practice who developed "Reality Therapy" and has published a book by the same name.¹ Glasser was convinced of the frequent ineffectiveness of much "conventional"² psychotherapy. This conviction led to the development of a theory of therapy which is based essentially upon need fulfillment, personal involvement and responsible behavior. We turn now to an exposition of the theory of Reality Therapy.

Need Fulfillment

Glasser begins by asking the question: "What is it that psychiatrists attempt to treat?"³ While there may be found in the clinical situation an infinite variety of symptoms, Glasser maintains that "everyone who needs psychiatric treatment suffers from one basic inadequacy: he is unable to fulfill his essential needs."⁴ It is understood that when a person's needs are successfully fulfilled the symptoms

¹William Glasser, *Reality Therapy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

²"Conventional" psychotherapy refers for the most part to Freudian psychoanalysis and to the successive systems of psychotherapy which do not generally question its main tenets.

³Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁴*Ibid.*

which require psychiatric treatment will disappear.

Glasser assumes that no matter how strange an individual's behavior may be, it has both meaning and validity for him because it represents his best effort at fulfilling his own needs.

In their unsuccessful attempts at need-fulfillment, all persons deny the reality of the world around them.⁵ This denial may take a multitude of forms, many of which are serious enough to bring an individual into a psychiatric relationship. Because of this denial of reality, Glasser understands the therapeutic task as including the guiding of persons toward reality. It is evident that for Glasser, this guidance of the patient toward reality involves far more than facing reality. Guidance toward reality includes fulfillment of a person's needs within the context of his real life situation.

Involvement

But how are persons to fulfill their needs? Glasser says this comes through the process of being intimately involved with other significant persons. "At all times in our lives we must have at least one person who cares about us and we care for ourselves. If we do not have this essential person, we will not be able to fulfill our basic needs."⁶ While one person is essential, the usual experience of individuals is to be involved with several others. This multiplicity of relationships is highly desirable. However, whether an individual has significant

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 7.

relationships with only one other person, or with several, "One characteristic is essential in the other person: he must be in touch with reality and be able to fulfill his own needs within the world."⁷ It is not particularly important that there be any formal relationship (e.g. family, religion) between the two persons who are involved with each other. The essential element is that in each case the individual holds the conviction that the other person cares for him. This awareness or conviction is essential for the fulfillment of needs from the time we are born to the time we die. Unless there is this quality of active involvement with one other, or preferably a group of others, a person will not be able to fulfill his needs.

Two Basic Needs

We have not yet made any definitive statement as to the needs which must be met in order for people to survive as persons, to relate responsibly to their environment and to other persons around them. Glasser believes that all humans have approximately the same physiological needs. While they might choose to describe these needs differently or to apply different labels, he maintains that no one seriously disputes a common set of essential needs for all persons in all cultures and in various degrees of civilization. Glasser states his understanding of the needs which concern psychiatry as follows: *"the need to love and be loved and the need to feel that we are worthwhile to ourselves and to others."*⁸

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 9.

While it is true that all persons have common needs (as defined above) their ability to fulfill these needs differs rather markedly. Glasser believes that in all cultures and societies there are individuals whose emotional needs go unsatisfied. These persons are understood to be candidates for Reality Therapy.⁹

In order to do justice to Glasser's position, we must examine the meaning he gives to these two basic needs in greater detail.¹⁰

First, both the need to give and receive love (viewed as a single entity) and the need to feel worthwhile are seen as being equal in importance.

Second, although the needs are in fact separate, Glasser believes that they are each one-half of a larger whole in the sense that a person who loves and is loved will usually feel worthwhile. However, this is not always the case. Glasser cites the example of an over-indulged child whose parents do not distinguish between loving him and accepting his behavior. The child knows the difference between right and wrong and is frustrated in that being loved for wrong acts does not allow him to feel worthwhile. Hence, it is understood that a part of fulfilling the need to be worthwhile depends upon seeing that one's being a love-object does not in itself give worth.

Regardless of whether or not we are loved, Glasser insists that

⁹While Glasser gives no specific criterion for a minimally fulfilled need, he does give examples which might enable his readers to deduce a kind of gross factor analysis.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 10-13.

in order to feel worthwhile we must maintain a satisfactory standard of behavior. Essentially, this means an internalization of some value system which is viable in society. We must learn to correct ourselves when we fail to meet the standard and to reward ourselves when we exceed it.

Glasser believes that when we are unable to fulfill one or both of these needs we feel pain or discomfort. Furthermore, the nature of personality requires that learning to fulfill these needs is a lifelong process. If we fail to learn, we will suffer (suffering being thought of as always driving us to try unrealistic methods to fulfill our needs). The sooner and more satisfactorily we learn to fill our needs the happier and more satisfying our life will be. But we must recognize that from time to time our situation will change in ways which will require us to learn and relearn to fulfill our needs under new conditions. It is significant that whatever the conditions under which we are living, and regardless of our relative success or failure in meeting our needs, we must be in touch with someone with whom we feel intimately involved.

We might say, therefore, that all people who have any kind of serious psychiatric problem *are at that time* lacking the proper involvement with someone--and, lacking that involvement, are unable to satisfy their needs.¹¹

Glasser is convinced that the involvement factor is critical in the process of fulfilling one's needs. Regardless of the presence of persons who either care or say they care, the person who comes for

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 12.

psychiatric help either is not able to accept their love, or does not care for them.

Therefore, appearances can be tragically misleading, as, for example, in the case of an individual who seems to have good family relationships and a sense of fulfillment, yet commits suicide.

It follows that to benefit from therapy, the person must gain or regain involvement, both with the therapist, and with significant others. Glasser believes that once this is accomplished, the psychiatric symptoms will disappear.

Finally (in relationship to understanding the two basic needs), it is of paramount importance that emphasis be placed upon the present. Needs are fulfilled within the context of the present, not in relationship to the past. Glasser writes: " . . . contrary to almost universal belief, nothing which happened in his past, no matter how it may have affected him . . . will make any difference once he learns to fulfill his needs at the present time."¹²

Responsibility

Central to the theory of Reality Therapy is Glasser's concept of responsibility. "Responsibility . . . is here defined as the ability to fulfill one's needs, and to do so in a way that does not deprive others of the ability to fulfill their needs."¹³ Glasser believes that responsible actions produce a feeling of being worthwhile.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹³*Ibid.*

A basic postulate is that responsibility is not inherited, but must be learned. This process of learning responsibility, like the process of learning to fulfill one's needs, is a complicated lifelong task. It follows that the concern of Reality Therapy is with those persons who have not learned or have forgotten how to act in responsible ways.

Glasser sees two types of personalities which provide exceptions to his definition of candidates for psychiatry via their irresponsible behavior.¹⁴ They are not normally subject to psychotherapeutic treatment.

The first type of personality is exemplified by Adolf Hitler. In short, a person who may fulfill his needs at the price of preventing other persons from fulfilling their needs.

The second group of persons would include those who only partially fulfill their needs, but who neither harm others nor ask for help. This group would include some homosexuals, recluses and various eccentrics.

Regarding the role of the therapist in the practice of Reality Therapy, Glasser believes in dispensing with the psychiatric labels which, he asserts, limit the focus of the therapist's attention to the behavior as he has already described it. In effect, Glasser maintains that such a practice puts therapeutic "blindness" upon the therapist. "The description *irresponsible* is much more precise, indicating

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

that our job is to help him become more responsible so that he will be able to satisfy his needs as himself."¹⁵ Glasser recommends the substitution of the term "responsible" for "mental health," and "irresponsible" for "mental illness." It should be noted that at times Glasser himself uses the conventional nomenclature, however, he claims that he does so only in describing irresponsibility in its various forms.

The Teaching of Responsibility

Glasser sees the teaching of responsibility as the most important task of man.¹⁶ However, man has no innate urge to perform such a task. In place of this kind of instinct, he has developed an intellectual capacity which enables him to see the need to teach responsibility. Children normally learn responsibility within the context of a loving parental relationship where such behavior is the usual example, although parents certainly are by no means the only teachers in this regard.

It is important to understand that individuals who are not intimately involved with others will not learn responsibility and will consequently suffer throughout their lives.

Glasser places a premium upon the early teaching of responsibility. He believes that it is both better and easier learned at a young age. He maintains that responsibility, like other subjects, is easier

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 16-20.

to learn correctly the first time than it is to try to overcome previous bad learning. It is acknowledged that learning responsibility is not an easy task, but for life to be satisfactory, Glasser considers it essential. Responsibility must be taught through discipline tempered with love. Such responsible behavior on the part of a parent, for example, shows the child that his parents care for him. Glasser cites the example of his five-year-old son.¹⁷ He asked the boy if he wanted to bathe in the large bathtub rather than the small one. The child said no. Again, the offer was made--with the understanding that the boy could splash and play in the larger tub. Again the boy said no. Whereupon his ten-year-old sister immediately shed her clothes and jumped into the tub. The boy threw a tantrum; Glasser ignored the howling protest and put him in his smaller tub. The boy was allowed to yell until he quieted down, seeing that his protest accomplished nothing. Then Glasser went in to him and simply said that he had a word of advice: "Never say no when you mean yes."

From this incident, as well as others, Glasser draws the following conclusion. *"Parents who are willing to suffer the pain of the child's intense anger by firmly holding him to the responsible course are teaching him a lesson that will help him all his life."*¹⁸

A parent also needs to remember that his is a twofold responsibility. Not only must he (or she) hold the child to a responsible course of action, but he must provide consistent examples of responsible

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 18.

behavior for the child to emulate.

In following Glasser's recommendations for teaching responsibility, parents need to appreciate the fact that " . . . *taking the responsible course will never permanently alienate the child.*"¹⁹

In short, persons learn how to act responsibly through significant and close involvements with others (preferably parents) who will love and discipline them, and who are willing to give them the freedom to put such new knowledge as they acquire to work in their living patterns.

It can therefore be readily seen that therapy for Glasser is an intense teaching period which tries to accomplish what should have been well established during normal growing up.

Furthermore, in any specific case, Glasser understands therapy as involving three interrelated procedures:

First, there is the involvement; the therapist must become so involved with the patient that the patient can begin to face reality and see how his behavior is unrealistic. Second, the therapist must reject the behavior which is unrealistic but still accept the patient and maintain involvement with him. Last, and necessary in varying degrees depending upon the patient, the therapist must teach the patient better ways to fulfill his needs within the confines of reality.²⁰

A Brief Summary of the Six Differences Between Conventional Therapy and Reality Therapy

Glasser contrasts Reality Therapy with what he labels as "conventional therapy." Conventional therapy is understood to be based to

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 19.

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

some degree upon a Freudian theory of mental illness. Glasser acknowledges a wide variety of therapeutic forms under this rubric, but holds that every form is based (either strictly or loosely) upon the work of Freud. Such therapy embodies the following six fundamental concepts.²¹

First, conventional psychiatry is convinced of the existence of mental illness; that people suffer from such illness and that they can be treated meaningfully according to the therapist's diagnosis.

Second, that probing the past is essential to treatment. This is based upon the assumption that once a person understands his illness he can then use this insight to change his attitudes. From such an attitudinal change the patient will develop effective patterns of relating.

Third, conventional psychiatry sees transference as a crucial part of the therapeutic process. Transference must be used to relive past crises, and to "work out" the difficulties associated with these critical episodes in the patient's life.

Fourth, even in superficial counseling, there is a strong emphasis placed upon insight into the unconscious mind. Unconscious conflicts are considered to be the grist for therapeutic interaction.

Fifth, conventional psychiatry avoids morality. Since deviant behavior is viewed as the product of mental illness, and mental illness the product (by and large) of unconscious conflict, then persons cannot be held responsible for morally deficient conduct.

²¹*Ibid.*

Sixth, teaching persons how to behave better is not an important part of conventional psychiatry. Once persons understand their psychic history and their intrapsychic conflicts they will learn to behave in more productive ways.

That Reality Therapy challenges these normally accepted criteria for doing therapy is obvious. But this is not quite all, for there is an overall difference as well. This is understood by Glasser in terms of the intense involvement of therapist with client in Reality Therapy. This involvement should be contrasted with the detached objectivity which the conventional psychiatric approach tries to maintain.

In contrast to conventional psychiatry, Reality Therapy differs markedly in both theory and practice on each of the six points described previously.²²

First; because mental illness is rejected as a concept, the patient is held responsible for his behavior.

Second; temporal emphasis is placed on present and future.

Third, the relationship of therapist to patient is one of authenticity, and not one wherein the therapist acts only as a detached observer or as a transference figure, but as himself.

Fourth; there is no searching for unconscious conflict, because this would excuse the patient from taking responsibility for his behavior.

Fifth; morality is emphasized. Issues of right and wrong are

²²*Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

squarely faced in the counseling sessions.

Sixth; a major part of the process includes teaching patients better ways to fulfill their needs. Glasser believes that proper involvement cannot be sustained unless behavior actually improves.

With this bare summary of Reality Therapy before us, it can be seen that the goal of such therapy is essentially limited to the task of helping a person adjust to the society in which he finds himself. Certainly this is admirable, but one may well ask whether there is a significant advantage to going beyond adjustment to one's society.

In such a work as this I have no intention of attempting to construct a through-going system of psychotherapy. However, it is my belief that Reality Therapy may be legitimately combined with another approach which views the therapeutic task from quite a different perspective. This other approach is found in the system of "Logotherapy" as it has been developed by Viktor Frankl.

II. SOME ASPECTS OF LOGOTHERAPY

An Introduction to Viktor Frankl

Logotherapy cannot be understood apart from the struggle of its creator. Viktor E. Frankl is now professor of psychiatry and neurology at the University of Vienna. He is the innovator and pioneer of a new form of therapy which is sometimes referred to as the Third Viennese School of Psychotherapy (to distinguish it from Freudian or Adlerian therapy).

While he was originally a student of Alfred Adler, he soon broke

away from the inner circle of Adlerian disciples because he could not accept the rigid orthodoxy and lack of self-critical thinking on the part of the Adlerian group.

During World War II, Frankl spent three years in Nazi concentration camps. Out of this experience came his best seller, *Man's Search for Meaning*. The events which led him to and through the experience of the death camps have unquestionably molded certain aspects of his therapy and have given to his views a strong testimony.

Frankl was already a psychiatrist in Vienna when Hitler marched into Austria. He had achieved considerable measure of success in neurology and had been assigned to run the Neurological Department of the Jewish Hospital. Although people were being sent to the camps, Frankl was not only allowed to stay on at the hospital, but his professional appointment enabled him to keep his elderly parents with him.

At one point Frankl tried, and finally after much difficulty succeeded in obtaining an immigration visa to the United States. He and his wife were free to leave the country and do as they pleased. But here he faced an agonizing existential decision. He was living in relative comfort in Vienna. He was being allowed to continue his professional interests, and he lived in the knowledge that his position was all that was saving his aged parents from the concentration camp. In an interview, Frankl tells something about the struggle he underwent in arriving at his decision to stay in Vienna:

They [his parents] were insisting [that he go to the United States]. You know, I've never told anyone about this--But about this time I had a strange dream, one that belongs to

my deepest experiences in the realm of dreaming. I dreamed that people were lined up--psychotics, patients--to be taken to the gas chambers. And I felt so deep a compassion that I decided to join them. I felt that I must do something and working as a psychotherapist in a concentration camp, supporting the people there mentally, would be incomparably more meaningful than just being one more psychiatrist in Manhattan.²³

Still Frankl faced the decision: To flee to America and leave his aged parents at the mercy of the Nazi's, or to remain with them thereby putting not only himself, but his wife in jeopardy. One evening he decided to attend a concert in the largest cathedral in the city. He felt that sitting and listening to the inspiration and beauty of the great organ might help him to resolve this impasse in his own mind. Although he pondered the options that evening, he still had not made up his mind what he must do. Going home later that same evening, he saw a small piece of marble sitting upon his father's radio.

I asked my Father what it was. He was a pious Jew and had picked up at the site of a large Viennese synagogue this stone, a part of the tablets containing the Ten Commandments. On the stone was an engraved and gilded Hebrew letter. My Father told me the letter occurred in only one of the commandments, 'Honor thy father and mother and you will stay in the land.' Thereupon, I decided to stay in Austria and let the American visa lapse.²⁴

²³Mary Harrington Hall, "A Conversation with Viktor Frankl of Vienna," *Psychology Today*, 1:9 (February, 1968), 57. The majority of personal material for this section comes from this interview.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 58. Note the error in the quotation of Exodus 20:12. The Revised Standard Version reads as follows: "Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you." This appears to refer to the promised land, and if so, one would imagine that Frankl would be aware of such meaning. It is interesting that Frankl admits that to some extent this piece of marble became for him, a projective test.

When he was taken into custody and sent to Auschwitz, Frankl had in his coat pocket a manuscript containing his theory of psychotherapy. This, along with everything else which belonged to prisoners, was confiscated. During his three years of camp life, Frankl reconstructed much of his work. He is deeply convinced that his theories received a profound test in the concentration camp and he looks upon his experience there as an empirical validation of his theories.

Frankl calls his system "Logotherapy" and defines it as follows:

Logos is a Greek word that denotes 'meaning!' Logo-therapy . . . focuses on the meaning of human existence as well as on man's search for such a meaning. According to logotherapy, the striving to find a meaning in one's life is the primary motivational force in man. That is why I speak of a *will to meaning* in contrast to the pleasure principle . . . on which Freudian psychoanalysis is centered, as well as in contrast to the *will to power* stressed by Adlerian psychology.²⁵

The Will To Meaning

I begin this section with a word regarding Frankl's understanding of the legitimate role of values in Logotherapy. He writes:

There are some authors who contend that meanings and values are 'nothing but defense mechanisms, reaction formations and sublimations.' But as for myself, I would not be willing to live merely for the sake of my 'defense mechanisms,' nor would I be ready to die merely for the sake of my 'reaction formations.' Man, however, is able to live and even to die for the sake of his ideals and values!²⁶

It is Frankl's conviction that values do not push, but pull a

²⁵Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search For Meaning* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1963), pp. 153-154.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

man (i.e., they are attractive and stand as polar opposites to instinctual urges). Since values always pull, they offer a freedom of choice. A man always has the capacity to determine the specific and personal values to which he will subscribe.

According to Logotherapeutic teachings there are three kinds of values: creative, experiential and attitudinal. Briefly, creative values are those which result from acts and accomplishments that add to the welfare of mankind. Experiential values are those which are realized when one becomes deeply sensitive to the truth, beauty and goodness of life. These two categories are widely recognized and traditional in many views. The third category of values according to Frankl is not so commonly recognized. Attitudinal values are those which are seen precisely in the areas where life is frustrated, or where success is hopeless.

Here the philosophical insight can become a precision tool of great therapeutic power in the hands of the skilled analyst, psychiatrist, or counselor. Where a life has been strictly limited as to creative and experiential values, it still can be led in therapy to achieve greatness in its attitudes. I must mention the fact that these value categories do not preclude the necessity of attitudinal values for the gifted person as well as for limited people. The Vienna clinic records tell of many persons, rich in creative and in experiential values who still came with deep neurotic illness that was cured by the therapy of attitudinal values. But here it is the *arztliche Seelsorger*, 'the medical minister,' in Frankl that leads him to put his main emphasis on the problem of human suffering. His wartime experiences as well as clinical work have given him a deep understanding and appreciation of the depths and the heights of every conceivable type of human suffering.²⁷

²⁷A. J. Ungersma, *The Search For Meaning* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), p. 30.

With this concept of the role of values clearly in mind, we can further discuss the concept of will to meaning. The concept which is suggested by this phrase is existential in nature. By existentialism, Frankl is talking about " . . . the no-thingness of man. Man is not just one thing among other things. He must not be totally objectified. He must not be manipulated. Man has value and dignity."²⁸

So man's will to meaning is a unique and specific thing. Meaning is individual and personal; it can and must be fulfilled by one alone. " . . . only then does it achieve a significance that will satisfy. . . ."²⁹

In an individual's search for his personal meaning, Frankl is concerned that values assume an objective quality; "For logos, or 'meaning,' is not only an emergence from existence itself, but rather something confronting existence."³⁰ Since an individual's unique and personal meaning is objective, it presents him with a challenge that can become a force involving him in commitment to that which he sees as a realistic and worthwhile reason for living. It should be further clearly stated that Frankl is convinced that man detects his own unique meaning in life; it is not something he manufactures or designs, but rather something he discovers.

Noögenic Neuroses and Noö-dynamics

Noögenic neuroses are simply those problems which emerge from

²⁸Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

²⁹Frankl, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 156.

conflicts between various competing values. Frankl writes:

Noögenic neuroses have their origin not in the psychological but rather in the 'noölogical' . . . dimension of human existence. This is another logotherapeutic term which denotes anything pertaining to the 'spiritual' core of man's personality.³¹

It is in this area of therapy that Frankl makes what I believe is one of his most valuable contributions. His Logotherapy teaches that "existential frustration" (a term used by Frankl to describe the feeling that life is meaningless) may in fact produce noögenic neurosis. If such a "meaning" or "spiritual" neurosis develops, it requires a therapy which reorients the patient toward meaning. Hence, it can be seen that a fundamental difference between Logotherapy and psychoanalysis lies in the view of man, i.e., as a being whose main concern lies in fulfilling meaning and living according to values rather than as an instinctual animal who seeks gratification and some reconciliation of intrapsychic conflict.

Noö-dynamics is a Logotherapeutic term referring to that state of inner tension which is healthy and creative in the human spirit.

Frankl gives a personal illustration:

As for myself, when I was taken to the concentration camp of Auschwitz, a manuscript of mine ready for publication was confiscated. Certainly, my deep concern to write this manuscript anew helped me to survive the rigors of the camp. For instance, when I fell ill with typhus fever, I jotted down on little scraps of paper many notes intended to enable me to rewrite the manuscript, should I live to the day of liberation. I am sure that this reconstruction of my lost manuscript in the dark barracks of a Bavarian concentration camp assisted me in overcoming the danger of collapse.³²

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 163.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 165.

Such tension as this between that already achieved and that which ought to be achieved is inherent to mental health and indispensable to well-being. Therefore, Logotherapy does hesitate " . . . about challenging man with a potential meaning for him to fulfill. It is only thus that we evoke his will to meaning from its state of latency."³³ Noö-dynamics then is precisely defined as "the spiritual dynamics in a polar field of tension where one pole is represented by a meaning to be fulfilled and the other pole by the man who must fill it."³⁴

The Meaning of Life and the Essence of Existence

A basic premise of Logotherapy is that meaning is always possible up to the last moment of life.³⁵ Frankl tells of an experience which goes far in illustrating the profundity of his position.

But I remember once when the lights were out and we lay in our earthen huts. The whole camp had been forced to fast for the day because no one would identify the half-starved prisoner who stole a few pounds of potatoes. Someone asked me there in the dark: 'Tell us now, psychiatrist. Where is there hope?' I told them we all faced death. But I told them that, in spite of this, I had no intention of losing hope and giving up. For no man knew what the future would bring, much less the next hour. And I spoke of the many opportunities of giving life a meaning. Human life never ceases to have a meaning and this . . . includes suffering and dying, privation and death. Unless there is such an unconditional meaning to life, there would be no point in surviving. When the electric bulb flared up again, I saw the miserable figures of my friends, limping toward me to thank me.³⁶

³³*Ibid.*, p. 166.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵Viktor E. Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul* (New York: Knopf, 1955), Introduction, p. xii.

³⁶Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

Frankl's belief in the infinite possibility of man's appropriating meaning for his life has the intensity of a strong religious faith. Yet for all its intensity, it still is profoundly open to the freedom of man. In short, the Logotherapist cannot arbitrarily attach meaning to things for his patient. Meaning has an objective quality, i.e., it cannot be manufactured but is always discovered. "This is an important issue," Frankl writes, "and this objectiveness of meaning is not just my philosophical conviction but comes from experimental psychological research."³⁷

Another basic premise or understanding in Logotherapy is that meaning is never general in character. Thus, Frankl writes:

One should not search for an abstract meaning of life. Everyone has his own specific vocation or mission in life; everyone must carry out a concrete assignment that demands fulfillment. Therein he cannot be replaced, nor his life be repeated.³⁸

Thus it can be seen that each person is challenged to a personal life task. Each man has a unique and specific opportunity to answer the question of who and what he is.

From this view of the meaning of life, it seems clear that there must be considerable emphasis placed upon an individual's responsibility for his own life. Speaking to this, Frankl says that every man has the responsibility for discovering the true meaning of his own unique situation.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 59.

³⁸Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*, p. 172.

That is why I often tell my American audiences that freedom threatens to degenerate into mere arbitrariness unless it is lived in terms of responsibility. That is why I recommend to you Americans that your Statue of Liberty on the East Coast be supplemented by a Statue of Responsibility on the West Coast.³⁹

Given this concept of the interrelatedness of freedom and responsibility, it is clear that Logotherapy calls for an active therapist who is involved with his patient. Frankl says that the Logotherapist is playing the role of an eye specialist rather than a painter. He explains his analogy thus: "A painter tries to convey to us a picture of the world as he sees it; an ophthalmologist tries to enable us to see the world as it really is."⁴⁰

The Meaning of Love

Frankl boldly maintains that the only way ever really to know another person is through love.⁴¹ Though this concept is exceedingly simple, its implications for the way in which one does therapy are significant.

Love allows one person to see the essential traits of another. More importantly, by his love the loving person becomes capable of seeing the best potentialities for good in the beloved. But perhaps most important of all the loving person, through the very process of giving love, becomes an enabler for the beloved. Thus, the loving person plays a positive role in actualizing the best potentialities of his

³⁹Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁴⁰Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*, p. 174.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, pp. 176f.

beloved.

It logically follows that love as understood in Logotherapy is quite different from love as understood in the traditional psychoanalytic or Freudian sense; i.e., " . . . as a mere epiphenomenon of sexual drives and instincts in the sense of a so-called sublimation."⁴² Frankl is convinced that "Love is as primary a phenomenon as sex."⁴³

The Meaning of Suffering

Frankl adroitly walks a tightrope between the heroic and the masochistic with regard to an understanding of suffering.⁴⁴ Logotherapy operates upon the premise that one's attitude is of paramount importance in regard to suffering. Frankl claims that suffering, if it can be given objective meaning, is man's highest value.⁴⁵ This follows from the basic tenet that man's essential concern is to see a meaning in his life.

Obviously, the suffering which is not absolutely necessary is masochistic and must be treated accordingly. However, the suffering which cannot be avoided challenges the Logotherapist to marshal his patient's capacity to fulfill the unique and specific meaning of his suffering.

Frankl relates an encounter with an elderly physician suffering from severe depression following the death of his wife some two years

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 177.

⁴³*Ibid.*

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 178ff.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*

before. Frankl simply confronted the man with the question of what life might have been like for his beloved if their roles had been reversed and she had been left to live on alone. The old gentleman said nothing, shook Frankl's hand and left calmly. Frankl writes: "Suffering ceases to be suffering in some way at the moment it finds a meaning, such as the meaning of sacrifice."⁴⁶ While Frankl admits that in the strict sense, this was not therapy at all, still it serves to illustrate how Logotherapy approaches the realm of human suffering.

III. THE COMPLIMENTARY RELATIONSHIP OF LOGOTHERAPY TO REALITY THERAPY

Although there are significant differences in the approach to therapy between Glasser's and Frankl's methodology, I believe they share some important ground which can provide the basis for a viable understanding of the psychological implications inherent in the teachings of Jesus. I believe that ultimately we will see that Logotherapy (especially with the concept of "will to meaning") picks up where Reality Therapy leaves off.

The essential task of Reality Therapy is to help a patient adjust to the society and world surrounding him in such a way that he will be able to fulfill his needs. Once this is accomplished, it is assumed that the task of therapy has been successfully concluded, but this is precisely the point at which Logotherapy makes its rather unique

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 179.

contribution. Frankl challenges man to discover what his life is all about. It is my belief that these two systems, seen in terms of their principle focus of operation deal with different levels of human experience, and do not necessarily exclude each other.

As a framework for understanding this complimentary relationship in greater detail, I will examine Glasser's six differences between Reality Therapy and conventional psychotherapy⁴⁷ as they relate to corresponding attitudes and approaches in Logotherapy.

The first difference is stated thus:

Conventional psychiatry believes firmly that mental illness exists, that people who suffer from it can be meaningfully classified, and that attempts should be made to treat them according to the diagnostic classification.⁴⁸

Reality Therapy, by way of contrast with conventional therapy, refuses to acknowledge the existence of mental illness. By abandoning usage of the concept of mental illness, Glasser believes that he is able to describe human behavior far more precisely in terms of responsibility. Reality Therapy, of course, further asserts the necessity for the therapist's becoming involved with his patient as a real person rather than as an intellectually comprehended psychological classification.

Frankl engages "conventional psychotherapy" (both Freudian and Adlerian) in a different polemic. Frankl believes that psychotherapy has a significant blind spot. He writes:

⁴⁷Glasser, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-60.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 42.

For we have shown that psychotherapy as it has hitherto been conceived needs to be supplemented by a procedure which operates, as it were, beyond the fields of the Oedipus complex and the inferiority complex. Or to put the matter more generally: beyond all affect-dynamics. What is still missing is a form of psychotherapy which gets underneath affect-dynamics, which sees beneath the psychic malaise of the neurotic his spiritual struggles. . . . Now however, a further step must be taken; we must look beyond psychogenesis, past the affect-dynamics of neurosis, in order to see the distress of the human spirit--and to try to alleviate this distress. We are well aware that in so doing the doctor assumes a position fraught with intricate problems, for it then becomes necessary for the doctor to take a stand on the question of values.⁴⁹

It is clear that there exists a real difference between Glasser and Frankl with regard to the concept of mental illness. However, it is also clear that Frankl does not accept *carte blanche* the concepts of instinctual urges so common to conventional psychotherapy. It seems to me that these instinctual urges go a long way toward what Glasser considers to be the responsibility-negating tendencies of conventional psychotherapy with its use of labels and the concept of mental illness.

The Logotherapeutic concept of the "spiritual" or "noetic" realm (where therapy is thought of not as the correction of a mental disease, but as the relieving of "spiritual distress") seems also a significant departure from traditional therapy.

Finally, while Frankl uses the term "neurosis," he does not always imply the presence of a pathological problem.⁵⁰

Glasser's second "difference" is as follows:

⁴⁹ Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. 12.

⁵⁰ See above, the discussion of noögenic neuroses, pp. 60-62.

Conventional psychiatry holds that an essential part of treatment is probing into the patient's past life--searching for the psychological roots of his problem because once the patient clearly understands these roots he can use his understanding to change his attitude toward life. From this change in attitude, he can then develop more effective patterns of living which will solve his psychological difficulties.⁵¹

Reality Therapy, in contrast to the conventional approach, considers the past as just so much "psychiatric garbage." A case history may be interesting in that it can provide generalizations, but it is of little help in therapy according to Glasser. The past cannot be changed, neither can the limits imposed by that past be altered by dealing with it. Therefore, Glasser is convinced that it is far more effective and efficient to concentrate upon present and future.

It must be remembered that traditional Freudian analysis views man as a creature largely determined in his behavior.

Logotherapy, by way of contrast, stresses man's freedom to choose and to change, even if it is only an attitude that a given man is capable of changing in a specific situation. Frankl writes: "Certainly man has instincts, but these instincts do not have him. . . . We are concerned above all with man's freedom to accept or reject his instincts."⁵²

It is evident that the whole thrust of Logotherapy is present and future oriented. While the significance of the past is not denied by Frankl, he places emphasis upon the necessity of "mobilizing the defiant

⁵¹Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁵²Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. xviii.

power of the human spirit."⁵³ Frankl writes:

The spiritual core of a person can take a stand, whether positive or negative, affirming or denying, in the face of his own psychological character structure, as when attempting to overcome a habit or resist an urge. This potentiality essentially inherent in human existence is called in logotherapy the psycho-noetic antagonism or the defiant power of the human spirit. What is meant thereby is man's capacity as a spiritual being to resist and brave whatsoever kind of conditioning, whether biological, psychological, or sociological in nature.⁵⁴

This difference in the area of concentration between conventional psychotherapy and Logotherapy is quite in line with Frankl's contention that his system is only intended to supplement psychotherapy and not to replace it.⁵⁵

Glasser's third difference grows out of the second:

Conventional psychiatry maintains that the patient must transfer to the therapist attitudes he held or still holds toward important people in his past life, people around whom his problems started. Using this concept, called transference, the therapist relives with the patient his past difficulties and then explains to him how he is repeating the same inadequate behavior with the therapist. The patient, through the therapist's interpretations of the transference behavior, gains insight into his past. His newly attained insight allows him to give up his old attitudes and to learn to relate to people in a better way, solving his problem.⁵⁶

Glasser claims that the conventional psychiatrist in the Freudian tradition allows his desire to utilize transference (in the attempt to

⁵³Robert C. Leslie, *Jesus and Logotherapy* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 24ff.

⁵⁴Viktor Frankl, "Existence and Values: Foundations of Logotherapy," as quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁵⁵Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. 20.

⁵⁶Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

more closely tie the past to the present, thereby improving the benefits gained from insight), to get in the way of a single and intense personal involvement of doctor with patient.⁵⁷ Instead, what actually happens is that the therapist " . . . attempts to gain a series of involvements such as mother to patient, father to patient, brother to patient, and employer to patient."⁵⁸ The end result of this is that crucial involvement essential to allowing the patient to change his irresponsible behavior is sacrificed.

Once again, Frankl's Logotherapy stands in a supplementary relationship to psychotherapy. While Frankl does not necessarily reject transference, he places great value upon intimate involvement between therapist and patient:

But the principle of psychotherapy will remain forever in my eyes as a process that cannot do away with the intimate basis. This factor cannot be relinquished. Whether you reduce this phenomenon to the mere psychodynamic plane or take it at its face value as a truly human personal or--to use deliberately a so-misused term--existential encounter, this intimate relationship is needed.⁵⁹

Glasser's fourth difference states that:

Conventional psychotherapy . . . emphasized that if the patient is to change he must gain understanding and insight into his unconscious mind. Unconscious mental conflicts are considered more important than conscious problems; making the patient aware of them through the interpretation of transference, dreams and free associations, and through educated psychiatric guessing, is necessary, if therapy is to succeed.⁶⁰

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*

⁵⁹Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁶⁰Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

Reality Therapy, by way of contrast, does not look for unconscious conflicts simply because this all too often becomes only one more way for a patient to excuse his own irresponsible behavior.

Without denying a legitimate role to psychotherapy in making unconscious conflicts conscious, Logotherapy directs its therapeutic efforts elsewhere.

It must, of course, be admitted that Logotherapy still places much of its emphasis upon insight. However, it must also be said that the insight is of quite a different character than insight in conventional psychotherapy. Logotherapeutic insight is insight into the meaning of life, love and suffering; this is a far cry from insight into unconscious conflicts.

Glasser's fifth difference says that conventional psychotherapy . . . scrupulously avoids the problem of morality, that is, whether the patient's behavior is right or wrong. Deviant behavior is considered a product of the mental illness, and the patient should not be held morally responsible because he is considered helpless to do anything about it.⁶¹

Like Reality Therapy, Logotherapy strongly asserts the essential responsibility of every person for his own life. Frankl writes:

As existential analysis it is particularly concerned with making men conscious of their responsibility--since being responsible is one of the essential grounds of human existence. In so doing, logotherapy necessarily raises human life to a higher power. . . . Existential analysis is psychotherapy whose starting point is consciousness of responsibility.⁶²

⁶¹Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁶²Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. 29.

Glasser's final difference comes with respect to the teaching role of the Reality Therapist. He writes:

Teaching people to behave better is not considered an important part of therapy in conventional psychiatry, which holds the patients will learn better behavior themselves once they understand both the historical and unconscious sources of their problems.⁶³

Teaching patients a better way to fulfill their needs is, of course, a major part of Reality Therapy. Giving the patient a clear and honest understanding of what reality (as seen through the experience of the therapist) expects of him in the way of responsible behavior is a straightforward way of approaching his present irresponsible actions.

While Logotherapy does not stress the role of the therapist as teacher, certainly it is also true that Frankl does not hesitate to assume that role in pointing to new perspectives for those who seek him out. The Logotherapeutic device of "paradoxical intention" will help to illustrate what I mean. Frankl illustrates this technique with the case of a young physician who consulted him because of a fear of perspiring.

Whenever he expected an outbreak of perspiration, this anticipatory anxiety was enough to precipitate excessive sweating. In order to cut this circle formation, I advised the patient, in the event that sweating should recur, to resolve deliberately to show people how much he could sweat. A week later he returned to report that whenever he met anyone who triggered his anticipatory anxiety, he said to himself, 'I only sweated out a quart before, but now I'm going to pour at least ten quarts!' The result was that, after suffering from his phobia for four years, he was able, after a single session, to free himself permanently of it within one week.⁶⁴

⁶³Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁶⁴Frankl, *Man's Search For Meaning*, p. 196.

By comparing Reality Therapy and Logotherapy on the basis of Glasser's six differences, we can see that these two systems of therapy have a great deal in common. Furthermore, it seems to me that there is nothing inherent in the nature of Frankl's Logotherapy that is necessarily tied to Freudian, Adlerian, or "conventional psychotherapy" (this final category being Glasser's own label and not always precise). While there are significant differences, there are also significant commonalities.

The bold approach of Logotherapy into the area of values, I believe, adds substantially to the overall scope of Reality Therapy.

As A. J. Ungersma writes:

As one of its tasks logotherapy proposes to handle philosophical problems within their own frame of reference. Without denying the truth in the psychoanalytic theory and method of handling the *irrational* influences of the unconscious, existential logotherapy does not propose to slough off the responsibility of handling *rational* problems in a rational way.⁶⁵

By bringing these two systems of therapy together, I believe we have a much more complete picture of man in relationship both to the society in which he lives and in relationship to his innermost self and God. Given this more complete picture (recognizing that it is not a systematic doctrine of man), we are now in a position to turn to the fourth and critical chapter of our work, namely the comparison of Jesus' perception of man with the views of Reality Therapy and Logotherapy.

⁶⁵ Ungersma, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARISON OF JESUS' PERCEPTION OF MAN WITH THE VIEWS OF MODERN THERAPY

For the purposes of organizational procedure, I propose to operate in terms of selected categories of major emphasis from both Glasser and Frankl. I shall be comparing these categories with what I believe to be appropriate corresponding emphases in the ministry and teachings of Jesus.

At the outset, I recognize the danger of research toward a preconceived goal. In this regard two things should be said. First, I am not attempting to say this is the only model for appropriating from the Synoptic record insights into an understanding of responsible interpersonal experience. Second, I am attempting to see where Jesus' teaching and ministry does not correspond with responsible interpersonal experience as understood by Glasser and Frankl.

Involvement

To provide a framework for the comparison of Jesus' teachings and ministry with the concept of involvement in Glasser's Reality Therapy is difficult when it is understood that the principle emphasis is not upon a specific technique, but upon a total qualitative relationship between two persons. It is noteworthy that Glasser thinks the type of involvement which is the initial goal in Reality Therapy is in no way limited to a therapeutic relationship of a formal

nature.¹ In order to proceed systematically, I shall follow Glasser's delineation of four major qualities which he believes to be necessary in the therapist for the effective use of Reality Therapy.²

In the first place, the therapist must be a very responsible person. Glasser maintains:

He must be able to fulfill his own needs and must be willing to discuss some of his own struggles so that the patient can see that acting responsibly is possible though sometimes difficult. Neither aloof, superior, nor sacrosanct, he must never imply that what he does, what he stands for, or what he values is unimportant. . . . Willing to admit that, like the patient, he is far from perfect, the therapist must nevertheless show that a person can act responsibly even if it takes great effort.³

Jesus was not above sharing some of his own struggles. Although the temptation accounts (Matthew 4:1-11, Mark 1:12-13, Luke 4:1-13) have likely been subject to expansion during the course of development in the tradition, "it is not legitimate to attribute the substance of the temptation-stories to the poetic imagination of the primitive community."⁴ If this be the case, then we have in Jesus an example of one who is willing to share what may well have been a difficult struggle in his own life with his disciples. Joachim Jeremias writes:

¹William Glasser, *Reality Therapy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 24-26. Glasser gives as an example of "ideal" therapeutic involvement, the relationship between Sir Thomas More and King Henry VIII of England as it is brought out in the play "A Man For All Seasons" by Robert Bolt.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 22-24.

³*Ibid.*

⁴Joachim Jeremias, *The Parable of Jesus* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 123.

If that is so, in view of Luke 22.31f., where Jesus tells his disciples about a conflict with Satan, it may be conjectured that underlying the different versions of the temptation-stories are words of Jesus in which, in the form of a *masal*, he told his disciples about his victory over the temptation to present himself as a political Messiah--perhaps in order to warn them against a similar temptation. Hence we may conclude that the different variants of the temptation-story should be closely associated with Mark 3:27; by them, in the form of a *masal*, Jesus assures his disciples of the same experience as that which in Mark 3:27 he asserts against his opponents--, now at this very hour, Satan is conquered, Christ is greater than Satan!⁵

Jesus was not aloof in the practice of his ministry. The emerging concept of the new righteousness, while not explicit in the teachings of Jesus, opens the course of his ministry to the *am ha'aretz* (i.e., the people of the land).⁶ So much is this the case that Jesus is accused of being "a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax-collectors and sinners!"⁷ Certainly it is safe to say that a significant, if not major portion of his earthly ministry, is directed to the common people of his day.

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶See above: For a discussion of the new righteousness refer to pages 21-25.

⁷Matthew 11:19. While Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 153, considers this passage to be a formulation by the post-Easter church, he bases his judgment upon the use of the "Son of Man" title as a Hellenistic product. However, he does acknowledge the possibility of an earlier source for the tradition wherein the "Son of Man" was not seen as an apocalyptic figure. Interestingly, Gunther Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963) p. 78, refers to the passage with no apparent suspicion of its authenticity.

Glasser believes that strength is the second necessary quality for involvement. He writes:

He must withstand the patient's requests for sympathy . . . for justification of his actions no matter how the patient pleads or threatens. Never condoning an irresponsible action on the patient's part, he must be willing to watch the patient suffer if that helps him toward responsibility.⁸

A clear example of Jesus' refusal to relax his standards for discipleship is found in the encounter with the man identified in tradition as the rich young ruler.⁹ The author of the Gospel indicates that Jesus wishes to have the young man join the disciples. We can safely infer that he would have made a valuable contribution to Jesus' ministry and message. But when he is faced with a concrete statement of the requirements for discipleship, he leaves unwilling to commit himself to the strong demands of Jesus.

This, I believe, shows dramatically Jesus refusing to condone an irresponsible action (from Jesus' perspective) on the part of another. If we can rely upon the accuracy of verse 22, Jesus would not allow the rich young ruler's sorrow to interfere with the need for responsible commitment upon his part.

The third quality necessary for the Reality Therapist is that he "must have knowledge and understanding about the person who is

⁸Glasser, *op. cit.*, pp. 22f.

⁹Mark 10:17-22. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 21f. considers this passage a genuine apothegm. He writes: "Mark's editorial work has gone into the introduction (v. 17a), and for the rest it is accurately constructed and conceived as a unity. . . ."

isolated or different because he cannot properly fulfill his needs."¹⁰ In short, the therapist must be willing to look at a person for what he is and accept him as a human being attempting to meet his needs. As a therapist, he must not be frightened by strange or bizarre behavior. As Glasser says, "The patient, recognizing a man who accepts, understands, and is not frightened, moves rapidly toward involvement."¹¹

The evidence is abundant to indicate Jesus' possession of this quality of accepting persons who are "different" or unable to fulfill their needs. Bornkamm in describing the recipients of Jesus' ministry writes the following:

The people who receive help from Jesus are . . . people on the fringe of society, men who because of fate, guilt or prevailing prejudice are looked upon as marked men, as outcasts: sick people who . . . must bear their disease as a punishment for some sin committed; demoniacs, . . . those attacked by leprosy, 'the first-born of death,' to whom life in companionship with others is denied; Gentiles, who have no share in the privileges of Israel; women and children who do not count for anything in the community; and really bad people, the guilty, whom the good man assiduously holds at a distance. At the same time we may look in vain for any trace of a romantic predilection for the 'underworld,' or a sentimentality which confuses the boundaries of good and evil, excuses guilt and caricatures virtue.¹²

The fourth major quality necessary for involvement is the ability of the therapist to become emotionally involved with each patient.¹³ While this sounds redundant, Glasser has more in mind than a restatement of his involvement thesis. He is convinced that "the therapist who can work with seriously irresponsible people and not be affected by

¹⁰Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

¹³Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

their suffering will never become sufficiently involved to do successful therapy."¹⁴

Upon reading certain passages of the Synoptics, one may wonder about the range of Jesus' pastoral concern for men. When he says to a potential follower who is willing to go, but only wants to bury his father; "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead" (Matthew 8:22 and Luke 9:60); we are left wondering about the extent of his suffering with others.

In this specific case (Matthew 8:22 and Luke 9:60) we must take into account the primacy of the Kingdom of God above all other concerns.¹⁵ When we gain this perspective, we see Jesus, not as unconcerned about man's needs, but deeply sensitive to a right priority for the fulfillment of his needs the highest of which is the attainment of the Kingdom of God.

The only place where the Synoptic Gospels specifically get to the matter of Jesus' suffering on behalf of others is in the section generally referred to as the first prediction of the passion.¹⁶ This material raises the question of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. Whether or not Jesus was aware of his own Messiahship is one of the problematic and unsolved questions of New Testament scholarship.

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵For a discussion of the primacy of the Kingdom of God, see above, Chapter II, pp. 9-13.

¹⁶Matthew 16:13-23, Mark 8:27-33, and Luke 9:18-22.

Looking beyond the issue of Messianic consciousness, we still have the problems related to the "Son of Man" title before we can deal with the reference to suffering. F. W. Beare writes:

. . . Matthew has introduced the title into the question put by Jesus: 'Who do men say that the Son of Man is?' (v. 13), where it replaces the personal pronoun of the Marcan version; and conversely, he now replaces Mark's 'Son of Man,' the personal pronoun. It would be hard to get clearer evidence that Matthew takes the phrase 'Son of Man' in this context to be no more than a surrogate for the personal pronoun.¹⁷

While this is only one point of view, and certainly does not adequately deal with the issue of the meaning of "Son of Man" in the Synoptics, it serves to show that the Christological implications are not of primary importance in understanding this specific text.

Certainly the genuine character of this as one of the sayings of Jesus is open to question. I do not propose to present opposing arguments here. Rather, I think the important thing for our consideration is that the followers of Jesus embraced at an early level in the tradition the role of Jesus suffering on their behalf. I think it may be safe to assume that this perception of Jesus (as indicated by the inclusion of this passage in the tradition) finds its roots in historical encounters between him and others.

Therefore, it is realistic to see Jesus as one who lived for others. Jesus was one whose relationships with others were marked with the kind of responsible, passionate involvement which Glasser considers

¹⁷ Francis Wright Beare, *The Earliest Records of Jesus* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 39.

so essential to progress in therapy. Gunther Bornkamm writes:

Jesus' aid bears . . . the stamp of a genuine involvement and a passionate tackling of the situation, when he is wrathful of the power of a disease (Mk. i. 41) and commands the demons (Mk. i. 25); but also in the blessing when he calls the children to himself and lays his hands upon them or upon the sick (Mk. x. 3ff.; vii. 31ff., etc.).¹⁸

The Two Basic Needs

Involvement is the basic prerequisite for need fulfillment.

Essential to the fulfilling of our basic needs is another person (preferably many other persons) with whom we are involved. This significant other person " . . . must be in touch with reality himself and be able to fulfill his own needs within the world."¹⁹

It is generally accepted that all humans have the same physiological and psychological needs. Competent people may describe or label these needs differently, but no one seriously disputes that in all cultures and in all degrees of civilization men have the same essential needs. A Chinese infant girl has the same needs as a Swedish King. The fulfillment of the physiological needs . . . are rarely the concern of psychiatry. Psychiatry must be concerned with two basic psychological needs: *the need to love and be loved and the need to feel that we are worthwhile to ourselves and to others*. Helping patients fulfill these two needs is the basis of Reality Therapy.²⁰

We have dealt at length with Jesus' teachings on love in a previous chapter.²¹ Here I want to add to that earlier work recognition of the love implied in Jesus' ministry. The historical event of Jesus

¹⁸Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 61. ¹⁹Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 8, 9.

²¹See above, Chapter II, pp. 30-35.

giving himself through a public ministry (regardless of its length) declares his love for men.

Especially pertinent are the teachings of the "greatest commandment" and the parable of the Good Samaritan. Together, these teachings give specific directions to the follower of Jesus. But the position of Jesus in regard to love goes beyond meeting minimum requirements. This is a major break with the Jewish tradition. One no longer loves in order to meet the conditions of the Jewish law, but rather loves because it is what God does and what God wills his people to do.

Glasser maintains that it is not enough either to love or to be loved, but that in order to fulfill a person's needs both must exist.²² It needs to be recognized and honestly admitted that Jesus nowhere points out the necessity of receiving love. We cannot expect this from Jesus because his purpose is not in describing the requirements for a healthy, well-rounded personality. Jesus comes proclaiming the dawning of the Kingdom of God. The coming Kingdom demands a decision on the part of men, either for God or for the world. We may choose to infer from this concept of the Kingdom the idea that man's needs will be met (because to the man who repents and chooses God, the Kingdom will come as joy).²³ However, there is nothing explicit in the teachings of Jesus concerning a person's need to be loved. Still, without a tacit assumption of the need of all men for love, it is difficult to see why there would be any responsibility to love one's neighbor.

²²Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

²³See above, Chapter II, p. 13.

The second basic need is to feel worthwhile both to ourselves and to others. Glasser maintains that this second need is equal in importance to the first. While the two needs are separate, they are usually present or absent as a unit, although this is not always the case.²⁴

Glasser writes:

But, whether we are loved or not, *to be worthwhile we must maintain a satisfactory standard of behavior.* To do so we must learn to correct ourselves when we do wrong and to credit ourselves when we do right. If we do not evaluate our own behavior, or having evaluated it, we do not act to improve our conduct where it is below our standards, we will not fulfill our need to be worthwhile and we will suffer. . . . Morals, standards, values, or right and wrong behavior are all intimately related to the fulfillment of our need for self-worth and . . . a necessary part of Reality Therapy.²⁵

We must be careful to distinguish properly between the prideful patting of oneself upon the back, and the honest giving of credit where credit is due. I believe this is a subtle, but crucial distinction. The invectives of Jesus against pride (especially against religious pride) are justified because the self-centered nature of pride erects a barrier between a man and God and between a man and his fellow-men. The honest recognition of a person as someone of worth is qualitatively different from self-centered pride. It is necessary both for an adequate level of self-esteem and for the courage to undertake additional goals throughout life.

The parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector illustrates something of the difference between self-centered pride and honest

²⁴Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 10. ²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 11.

understanding of self-worth.²⁶ The tax-collector is justified (made to feel worthwhile, among other things) by his honest recognition of a failure on his part to meet an appropriate standard of behavior. The Pharisee is not justified because he has not made an adequate evaluation of his own behavior according to the standards of the new righteousness. This interpretation of the parable hinges upon whether one takes as an appropriate standard of behavior the new righteousness or the traditional understanding of the Jewish law.

More than attitude is involved in this interpretation of the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector. God's justification of the tax-collector is based upon the sincere repentance of the man, and (we may imply) the formulation of a plan²⁷ whereby past irresponsible behavior (collecting excessive taxes for personal profit) will no longer be continued.

Concluding his discussion of the two basic needs, Glasser notes that fulfillment has nothing to do with the past.²⁸ No matter how the past may have affected a person, he will fulfill his needs in the present and the future or not at all.

It is obvious that the same rejection of the past as controlling the present and the future may be found in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector. The Pharisee's past action (having met and

²⁶See above, for a discussion of the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector, Chapter II, pp. 21-23.

²⁷Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 37. The formulation of a plan is a significant first step toward responsible behavior in Reality Therapy.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 13.

exceeded the requirements of the Jewish law) will not affect his present ability to continue meeting the law except for the matter of habit. The justification of the tax-collector indicates clearly that he is free from any limiting effects of the past.

Furthermore, the limiting effects of the past are removed from consideration of the future in Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom of God. The significant change whereby salvation and repentance change places indicates that by his grace, God chooses to forgive the past. Man can, therefore, concentrate upon the present and the future.

Responsibility

Fundamental to the theory and practice of Reality Therapy is the concept of responsibility. Glasser defines responsibility "as the ability to fulfill one's needs, and to do so *in a way that does not deprive others of the ability to fulfill their needs*."²⁹ This definition of responsible behavior becomes the key to evaluating all human behavior for Glasser. Intellectually, this is a simple ideal, but it is certainly not so frequently exhibited in human behavior as its simplicity might suggest.

Although we all have the same needs, there are vast differences in our abilities to fulfill them. A premise of Reality Therapy is that as needs go unfilled, the individual suffers accordingly. Therefore, the concern of Reality Therapy is "*with those who have not learned, or*

²⁹ *Ibid.*

*who have lost the ability [to fulfill their needs]-- . . . these people are described as irresponsible."*³⁰

We have already seen that the primary cause and the principle purpose in Jesus' ministry was the Kingdom of God. The coming Kingdom demands a response from men. It is clear that Jesus called men to what he believed to be the only course of action wherein their deepest needs might be met.

Bornkamm writes:

And yet Jesus' call to repentance . . . is heard in view of the dawning of the kingdom of God. This gives it its reasons and its ultimate urgency. Jesus' message here comes very close to John the Baptist's. 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Mt. iii. 2; iv. 17).³¹

Repentance now means: to lay hold on the salvation which is already at hand, and to give up everything for it. . . . Repentance now means: no longer to make excuses with a thousand otherwise cogent reasons, like the guests who were first invited to the supper; but to accept the invitation, to set out, to come (Lk. xiv. 16ff.; Mt. xxii. 1ff.).³²

It might be argued that such a premium placed upon one goal, such as Jesus placed upon the Kingdom of God, would inhibit an individual from meeting other needs. This hinges upon whether one accepts the broad outlines of a Christian view of the universe. If one chooses not to accept this view of the universe, then a study such as the one I am engaged in here would have no meaning whatever. If, on the other hand, one accepts the concept of the Kingdom of God as taught by Jesus,

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 14.

³¹Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

³²*Ibid.*

then placing a high priority upon man's repentance and response not only makes sense, but is the only responsible course of action.

Both Reality Therapy³³ and the teaching of Jesus place an emphasis upon behavior as being more important than promises. This is perhaps best illustrated with Jesus' parable of the Two Sons:

'What do you think? A man had two sons; and he went to the first and said, "Son, go and work in the vineyard today." And he answered, "I will not"; but afterward he repented and went. And he went to the second and said the same; and he answered, "I go, sir," but did not go. Which of the two did the will of his father?' They said, 'The first.' Jesus said to them, "Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."³⁴

Concerning certain problems in the text of this parable F. W.

Beare writes:

There are extraordinary textual variations in these verses, and the original text is hardly to be constituted with certainty. . . . In some witnesses, the order in which the two sons are mentioned is reversed, and the answer to the question of Jesus becomes, 'The last.' The point is unchanged; it is still agreed that the son who first said 'No,' but afterwards repented and went, is the one who did his father's will. But in an important group of witnesses, headed by D (Codex Bezae), we have the sons introduced in the order of the text before us, but in v. 31 the surprising (defiant?) answer is given, 'The last.' That is, it is claimed that the son who said 'I will' but did not go, is the one who did his father's will.³⁵

³³Glasser, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-30.

³⁴Matthew 21:28-31. Note: Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 177 indicates that this makes sense only as an allegory and not as a parable. Also, I have only given the text through verse 31 whereas most scholars include verse 32 and indicate its secondary addition to this passage.

³⁵Beare, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

Taking into account these difficulties, the point of the parable is still clear, regardless of whether the opponents of Jesus voice their own judgment. Promises have come from their lips in great profusion, but responsible behavior has not followed. Therefore, God's judgment is upon those who profess faith but do not demonstrate their sincerity through appropriate behavior.

It must be admitted that while there are strong similarities between Jesus' view of responsibility and Glasser's definition of what constitutes responsible behavior, there are likewise significant differences. One major difference is to be found in the view of the meaning of life which is explicit in their respective teachings. Responsibility, (while it is never defined) is for Jesus only meaningful with respect to the coming Kingdom of God. However, it must also be said that responsible behavior in the light of the Kingdom has radical implications for interpersonal relationships. By way of contrast, Glasser considers responsibility largely in terms of self³⁶ in relationship to society.

This difference between a thoroughgoing theocentric understanding of man on the one hand, and a largely anthropocentric perspective of him on the other does, of course, lead to differences in the theory and goals which make for meaningful and satisfying living. It is my own opinion, however, that while this difference is significant at the

³⁶By "self" I do not mean to imply any irresponsible self-seeking behavior. Especially, I refer to the Freudian pleasure-principle, which I believe Glasser would reject.

philosophical or theological level, it is not nearly as problematical at the practical level as might be supposed.

Glasser in developing his theory of responsibility writes: "The teaching of responsibility is the most important task of all higher animals, man most certainly included."³⁷ By assigning this highest priority to the task of teaching responsibility Glasser is emphasizing the necessity of an individual's learning appropriate ways of fulfilling his needs, thereby saving himself and others from great suffering throughout life.

It is my own conviction that Glasser would in no way equate the priority of teaching responsibility with Jesus' highest priority, i.e., repent and follow God! Glasser's singular explicit concern is for persons to lead satisfying and responsible lives. He is not writing a theology and we cannot expect him to take into account the relationship of this ordering of priorities to the religious life as taught and lived by Jesus.

However, the essential need for teaching persons how to fulfill their needs through responsible behavior is not far from Jesus' own role as a teacher of God's truth. An understanding of the parables indicates something of Jesus' role as teacher. Joachim Jeremias, writing about the nature of the parables, gives us an insight into their challenging and effective teaching nature:

³⁷Glasser, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

What we have to deal with is a conception which is essentially simple but involves far-reaching consequences. It is that the parables of Jesus are not--at any rate primarily--literary productions, nor is it their object to lay down general maxims ('no one would crucify a teacher who told pleasant stories to enforce prudential morality'), but each of them was uttered in an actual situation of the life of Jesus, at a particular and often unforeseen point. Moreover, as we shall see, they were preponderantly concerned with a situation of conflict. They correct, reprove, attack. For the greater part, though not exclusively, the parables are weapons of warfare. Everyone of them calls for immediate response.³⁸

The nature of the parables, their abundance, and the reflection of earliest tradition, which is evident in them, leads me to the conclusion that teaching was a central role in the life and ministry of Jesus. While the content was uniquely his message concerning the coming Kingdom of God and all its implications, the ramifications of this message and Jesus' teaching ministry for interpersonal relationships are not at odds with the underlying principles espoused by Reality Therapy.

The limited scope of Reality Therapy does not purport to give us a systematic or comprehensive understanding of man. In particular, as we have earlier noted, Glasser's work makes no attempt to answer the philosophical questions concerning the meaning of a man's existence, but is content to help him live in a way which meets life realistically and works prudently to meet needs within honest living situations.

Earlier in this dissertation, I have discussed the complementary relationship of Reality Therapy to the Logotherapy of Viktor Frankl.

³⁸Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 21. Note: The quotation in parentheses is from C. W. F. Smith, *The Jesus of the Parables* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948).

What remains for us to now do is to compare significant categories of Frankl's system with the teachings of Jesus, looking for an understanding of the perception of man in both, and seeking to find in the Synoptic record those types of interpersonal experience (whether taught or lived) which validate my thesis: that Jesus related to persons in a remarkably therapeutic way.

The Meaning of Life

"What is the meaning of life?" This is perhaps the most perennial question of the human mind. Viktor Frankl believes that the specific meaning of an individual's life in a given moment is the *sine qua non* of human existence.³⁹ Using this as both the starting point and central focus for Logotherapy, Frankl attempts to help a person discover the meaning of his life. Once this unique and specifically personal meaning is discovered, the person is challenged with the potential in him to fulfill the meaning of his life.⁴⁰

Jesus found the meaning of his life only in connection with the Kingdom of God; and he taught those who followed him to search for the meaning of their lives through discipleship.⁴¹

Mark's Gospel gives us what may be a traditional listing of the twelve following this introduction: "And he appointed twelve, to be

³⁹Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search For Meaning* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1959), p. 174.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁴¹For a discussion of discipleship, see above, pp. 36-38.

with him, and to be sent out to preach and to have authority to cast out demons."⁴² Concerning the call of the inner circle of disciples,

Bornkamm writes:

The twelve disciples are scarcely the creation of the post-Easter church, as has been suggested, though they had certainly a representative significance in the earliest years. Their institution certainly goes back to the historical Jesus, because the fact that Judas Iscariot belonged to their circle was a serious stumbling-block to the later church.⁴³

Given our historical perspective, what seems clear is that Jesus was able to help the inner circle of the disciples see that meaning for their lives might be discovered by following him. He challenged them with this meaning for their lives. Then, in the process of working with them in a public ministry, he labored to actualize the meaningful potentials in each of these close followers.

Furthermore, Jesus' calling of the disciples, whatever its origin in history, can serve to illustrate Frankl's conviction that life challenges men with its meaning.

As each situation in life represents a challenge to man and presents a problem for him to solve, the question of the meaning of life may actually be reversed. Ultimately, man should not ask what the meaning of his life is, but rather must recognize that it is *he* who is asked. In a word, each man is questioned by life; and he can only answer to life by *answering for* his own life; to life he can only respond by being responsible.⁴⁴

While it is somewhat outside of the province of our consideration

⁴²Mark 3:14. For a critical commentary upon this text, see Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 391 (Appendix to p. 61).

⁴³Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

⁴⁴Frankl, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

of the teachings of Jesus, it certainly can be said that the disciples were challenged by the future following the crucifixion. Faith in the resurrection and the tremendous energy required to bring the earliest Christian communities into being must surely rank as one of the great responses to strong challenge in all of history.

Helping persons to discover the meaning of their lives is, according to Frankl, the province of the *ärztliche Seelsorger* (medical minister). For Frankl, this therapy is indicated when any one of the following three conditions exist:

In the first place it is indicated wherever a patient literally thrusts upon us his spiritual conflicts. . . . Secondly, existential analysis is always indicated when the patient proves to be a person . . . with whom psychotherapy 'in terms of the mind' represents the most promising method. . . . Thirdly, medical ministry is indicated wherever inevitable 'fated' conditions exist in the life of the patient, where he is crippled or faced with an incurable disease or chronic invalidism. It is also useful where persons are in a really inescapable predicament, faced with unalterable difficulties imposed from outside themselves.⁴⁵

Frankl gives an account of one doctor responding as a "medical minister" within the context of his surgical profession.

A prominent attorney had to have his leg amputated for arteriosclerotic gangrene. When he left his bed for the first time after the operation to try to walk on one leg, he burst into tears. Whereupon his doctor asked him whether he hoped to run a four-minute mile--because only if that were his aim did he have any cause for despair. This question instantly conjured up a smile amid the tears. The patient had promptly grasped the obvious fact that human life is not so poor a thing that the loss of a limb would make it meaningless.⁴⁶

⁴⁵Viktor E. Frankl, *The Doctor and The Soul* (New York: Knopf, 1963), pp. 279f.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 278.

Two things seem to be involved in this anecdote which Frankl uses to explain the role of the "medical minister." First, there is the relief of suffering. Second, and more generic to the process by which suffering is relieved and therapy given is the role of the "medical minister" as one who helps a patient gain a wider perspective on the total meaning of his existence.

It is in this second sense that Jesus was a "medical minister" to both Mary and Martha when a guest in their home.⁴⁷

According to the text, Martha is "distracted with much serving," or as we might say, she was doing her utmost to insure her reputation as the perfect hostess. When Mary will not help her impress their guest, Martha attempts to use the authority of Jesus to force her sister into assisting her with the serving. In response to Martha, Jesus places things in perspective (i.e., the most important thing about him is his message of the coming Kingdom of God and the necessity to repent and enter into that Kingdom). Mary has chosen not to be "anxious and troubled about many things," but to concentrate upon the "one thing [which] is needful."⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Luke 10:38-42.

⁴⁸ Bultmann, *op. cit.*, considers Luke 10:38-42 a "biographical apothegm" of an "ideal" nature. His judgment as to the "ideal" nature of the apothegm is meant to convey his conviction that the passage is symbolic in nature, and that it is either Jesus or the church speaking about the one needful thing (pp. 33 and 56f.).

Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), takes a somewhat different position in designating this text a "legend." By this is meant a narrative about some sainted person, with no judgment as to historicity implied. Dibelius believes that this text is of unusual worth. He writes: ". . . every

In showing Martha a different and more realistic set of priorities, Jesus demonstrated in the existential moment the fact that life is meaningful in ways far more profound than the performance of menial chores. Persons should follow Mary in choosing the "good portion" (i.e., the Kingdom of God) which gives meaning and satisfaction to living.

The Meaning of Love

Frankl describes love using philosophical and psychological language. While not using a traditional religious terminology, his description still bears considerable resemblance to ἀγάπη.⁴⁹ He writes about love between two persons as follows:

Loving represents a coming to relationship with another as a spiritual being. The close connection with the human spirit in the partner is the ultimate attainable form of partnership.

sentence contains something special, the narrative is detailed throughout, though not with secondary things about time, place, home-circumstances, but with a decisive question which altogether dominates it. In spite of the fact that this Legend of the two sisters ends with the honorification of a secondary person, it must be regarded as historically valuable on account of its detail and its definiteness" (p. 121).

⁴⁹Mary Harrington Hall, "A Conversation with Viktor Frankl of Vienna," *Psychology Today*, I:9 (February, 1968), 63, speaks to this matter in an interview with Frankl where she asked whether he was a formally religious man. His answer follows: "Let me be 100 per cent European by not answering this question. Let me say that the Hippocratic oath I took when I received my medical degree compels me to care for and insist that logotherapy be available for every patient, including the agnostic, and usable in the hands of every doctor, including the atheist."

The lover is . . . moved to the depths of his rational soul, moved by the partner's rational soul, which embraces both the other's physical being and psyche. Love, then, is entering into direct relationship with the personality of the beloved, with the beloved's uniqueness and singularity.⁵⁰

Such a relationship as this may be illustrated, (though not just between two persons) in the relationship between Jesus and the disciples. The fact that disciples followed him is in itself suggestive of a loving relationship which respects the individuality and personality of each. This I believe can be assumed without major difficulty for without respecting the personhood of the disciples it is questionable whether they would have followed him or sacrificed for his message at all. A tradition such as the one found in Mark 1:16-20 and parallels can under no circumstances be conceived as a historical one. Bultmann rightly sees this as another "ideal biographical apothegm."⁵¹ Still, the very existence of disciples who followed Jesus presupposes some form of call (whether formal or informal is beside the point). What is essential is that the call clearly comes on the basis of a quality of relationship between Jesus and these men which can be satisfactorily described only in terms of love.

Frankl's view of love includes, but transcends physical attraction and erotic sexuality. The most significant aspect of love (in that it penetrates most deeply into the personality of the partner) is to be found in that quality of relationship which seeks the uniqueness

⁵⁰Frankl, *The Doctor and The Soul*, p. 152.

⁵¹Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 56f.

and singularity of the partner. Thus, it is impossible to "transfer" feelings of love in any realistic way from one person to another. This quality of love is described by Frankl in the recounting of the experience of a former concentration camp inmate:

As far as I was concerned, I felt duty-bound toward my mother to stay alive. We two loved one another beyond all else. Therefore, my life had a meaning--in spite of everything. But I had to count upon death any minute of every day.⁵²

The prisoner then goes on to recount that whenever time and conditions in the camp permitted, he dwelt upon the inner personality of his mother. . . . 'But I did not know whether my mother herself was still alive. All the time I was in camp we were without news of one another. Then it struck me that when, as I so frequently did, I was holding dialogues in my mind with my mother, the fact that I did not even know whether she was alive hardly disturbed me!' ⁵³

The striking fact in this account is that love transcended not only physical presence, but also even the knowledge that the beloved was alive. This quality of "love-in-spite-of" is found also in the nature of God as described in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The rejoicing of the father over the son's return "describes with touching simplicity what God is like, his goodness, his grace, his boundless mercy, his abounding love."⁵⁴

Jeremias in analyzing the parable points to the fact that once the prodigal's claim has been settled he is no longer entitled to any further consideration. Yet grace abounds because of the father's love, and it is in this love that the son's life finds meaning. Jeremias

⁵²Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. 155.

⁵³*Ibid.*

⁵⁴Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

believes that this is a story drawn from life. In viewing the son as a historical human being we may safely assume that it is the love of the father which helps him finally to "come to himself."⁵⁵ In this sense there is a real affinity between the love of God for man as described by Jesus' parable and the love which gives meaning for living as explicated by Frankl.

Love also serves to actualize the potential in the one who is loved. Frankl says that "the loving person enables the beloved person to actualize these potentialities. By making him aware of what he can be and of what he should become, he makes these potentialities come true."⁵⁶

Indicating the essential "religious" character of this enabling factor, Frankl quotes three men who define the same quality in love and its consequences:

Scheler defines love as a movement of the mind toward the highest possible value of the loved person, a spiritual act in which this highest value--which he calls the 'salvation' of a person is apprehended. Spranger makes a similar comment: that love perceives the potentialities of worth in the beloved person. V. Hattingberg expresses it differently: love sees a person the way God 'meant' him.⁵⁷

The account of the Rich Young Ruler⁵⁸ gives us a negative

⁵⁵Luke 15:17.

⁵⁶Frankl, *Man's Search For Meaning*, p. 177.

⁵⁷Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, p. 167f.

⁵⁸Mark 10:17-22. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, considers this a genuine apothegm. This is not to say that he considers it a historical word from Jesus, but to indicate its unitary character and to open the possibility for its being a historical word. He regards it as likely from the oral period of the development of the tradition (pp. 21f.).

example of the enabling factor in love. "And Jesus looking upon him loved him. . . ." But this love was not successful in enabling the young man to meet the difficult demands for discipleship. Even so, from the viewpoint of the Christian, Jesus offered the young man "salvation" as it is defined by Scheler and understood by Frankl.

The Meaning of Suffering

Frankl writes:

Whenever one is confronted with an inescapable, unavoidable situation, whenever one has to face a fate that cannot be changed, e.g., an incurable disease, such as inoperable cancer, just then is one given a last chance to actualize the highest value, to fulfill the deepest meaning, the meaning of suffering. For what matters above all is the attitude we take toward suffering, the attitude in which we take our suffering upon ourselves.⁵⁹

Jesus' parable of the Pharisee and the Publican gives us an insight into the matter of suffering.⁶⁰ As is so often the case, we must draw an inference from the material. In this case we must infer suffering on the part of the tax-collector. But how else can we describe the emotions which might have led a man to pray such a prayer. If we consider the tax-collector as something more than a parabolic foil for the expression of the single primary point, then it seems to me evident that his life was given meaning in that by God's forgiveness, suffering (emotional anxiety) was removed.

⁵⁹ Frankl, *Man's Search For Meaning*, p. 178. Also, see above, pp. 65-66.

⁶⁰ Luke 18:9-14. See above, pp. 21-23.

Frankl is convinced that in attempting the heroic a lack of success does not signify lack of meaning. He writes:

The untenability of the cult of success becomes obvious as soon as we consider the moral problem of sacrifice. Insofar as a sacrifice is 'calculated,' performed after careful reckoning of the prospects of its bringing about a desired end, it loses all ethical significance. Real sacrifice occurs only when we run the risk of having sacrificed in vain. Would anyone maintain that a person who plunges into the water to save someone has acted less ethically, or unethically, because both are drowned?⁶¹

The parallels between this view of suffering as a spontaneous sacrifice and Jesus' crucifixion are immediately apparent. While it is extremely tempting to conclude that this was the reason for Jesus going to the cross, just such a conclusion would violate the principles under which I have been attempting to operate. Perhaps it is true that from the standpoint of a counselor and counselee within the Christian tradition, the assumption of this may be taken for granted. But this is either theological speculation or Christian faith, neither of which places the historicity of the teachings and actions of Jesus in a primary position. In short, when we attempt to draw such a parallel, we have crossed the boundary and have left our chosen field of investigation for what may appear as "greener grass" on the other side.

What may be of more value than the "greener grass" may also be accessible to us within the limits of this work. Throughout, I have operated on the established conviction that Jesus' primary concern was to announce the coming Kingdom of God. I am convinced of the primacy

⁶¹Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul*, pp. 122f.

of this part of his message and I am equally convinced of his seriousness in calling disciples to assist in proclaiming the Kingdom.

While Bultmann and others point to the secondary quality of Matthew 5:11ff. (based upon a questioning of the blessedness of the follower) I believe we can legitimately claim a heroic effort on the part of persons who, through the ages have sacrificed and suffered greatly to further this primary concern of Jesus. And, if the existence of the church in the world today be accurate testimony; mankind has found much meaning in the personal and corporate sacrifices made to insure the survival and growth of the church.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The Application and Its Limits

In considering the nature of this dissertation, three factors seem critical in applying the material here gathered to the local church counseling setting.

In the first place the teachings of Jesus, while perhaps having some meaning for most men, gain their full importance only for those persons in the tradition. Therefore, the material which I have assembled is applicable only when both counselee and counselor stand within the Christian tradition. It must also be clearly recognized that for such persons the words and actions of Jesus become to some degree a sanction. To what extent they may be objectively considered to have merit on the basis of their truth is something I have not attempted to decide.

The second factor in determining the applicability of this material is of course the nature of the subject under consideration during each counseling interview. While it is my belief that this understanding of responsible interpersonal experience in the light of Jesus' life and thought is applicable in a wide range of counseling, my own short experience is insufficient for me to claim more.

The third factor which I see limiting the applicability of this approach is found in its own nature. As I see it, this approach is essentially illustrative in style. This implies that the legacy of

Jesus (insofar as I have explicated it) is to be used as an impetus to responsible behavior on the part of a counselee. This is my conscious intention and I believe the Synoptic record best lends itself to this type of use.

The Style

In the beginning of this work I determined to attempt to gain an "understanding of responsible interpersonal experience." The goal which I envisioned and endeavored to achieve was not that of a polished and complete system, but rather a collection of what might honestly be used as raw material for the counseling process. In order to use this material I believe a counselor must have not only a considerable amount of counseling skill, but also some solid insight into the origin and growth of the Synoptic record as well as a grasp of the history and philosophy associated with the first century. Further, I believe the counselor must be willing to let the essential message of the Synoptic record speak through his application of it.

This style or method which has evolved out of my work is one that I believe meets the requirements of sound biblical scholarship and consistent interpretation based upon adequate exegesis. Even though I have relied upon the exegesis of chosen scholars I believe I have met this requirement. I am convinced this style can give a local clergyman some guidelines for utilizing the confluence of Jesus' life and thought with a hybrid form of contemporary psychotherapy.

By no means do I consider this work complete or my own investigation at a conclusion. On the contrary, this is for me, the first step in working out a clinically verifiable and therapeutically useful approach to understanding responsible interpersonal experience. If this dissertation can point to a viable way of using a part of the Christian heritage appropriately within a counseling setting, then I shall have been satisfied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Argyle, A. W. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The Earliest Records of Jesus*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Biddle, E. Earl. *Integration of Religion and Psychiatry*. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Boisen, Anton. *Out of the Depths*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- _____. *The Exploration of the Inner World*. New York: Willet, Clark, 1936.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Trans. Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Braaten, Carl E., and Roy A. Harrisville (eds.) *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Brister, C. W. *Pastoral Care in the Church*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Buhler, Charlotte. *Values in Psychotherapy*. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Trans. John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- _____. *Jesus and the Word*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- _____, and Karl Kundsinn. *Form Criticism*. Trans. Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.
- Clebsch, W. A., and C. R. Jaekle. *Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. *Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

- _____. *Mental Health Through Christian Community*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. *An Approach to the Teachings of Jesus*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1957.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Cox, Harvey. *God's Revelation and Man's Responsibility*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1965.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- _____. *Jesus*. Trans. Charles B. Hendrick and Frederick C. Grant. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Dominian, J. *Psychiatry and the Christian*. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1962.
- Doniger, Simon. *Religion and Human Behavior*. New York: Association Press, 1954.
- Fabry, Joseph B. *The Pursuit of Meaning: Logotherapy Applied to Life*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Frankl, Viktor E. *Man's Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1959. Originally published as *From Death Camp to Existentialism*.
- _____. *The Doctor and the Soul*. New York: Knopf, 1963.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Fuchs, Ernst. *Studies of the Historical Jesus*. Naperville: Allenson, 1964.
- Glasser, William. *Mental Health or Mental Illness? Psychiatry for Practical Action*. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- _____. *Reality Therapy: A New Approach to Psychiatry*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Goguel, Maurice. *The Life of Jesus*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1933.

- Grant, Frederick C. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. New York: Macmillan, 1940.
- _____. *The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Guntrip, Henry. *Psychotherapy and Religion*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Haley, Jay. *Strategies of Psychotherapy*. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1963.
- Hall, Calvin S. *A Primer of Freudian Psychology*. New York: New American Library, 1954.
- Hiltner, Seward. *Preface to Pastoral Theology*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958.
- Howe, Reuel L. *The Miracle of Dialogue*. New York: Seabury Press, 1963.
- Huch, Albert. *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. Rev. ed. by Hans Lietzmann, Eng. ed. F. L. Cross. New York: American Bible Society, 1957.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.
- Kegley, Charles W., and R. W. Bretall (eds.) *The Theology of Paul Tillich*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Kemp, Charles F. *Physicians of the Soul*. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- Leslie, Robert C. *Jesus and Logotherapy*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- Maves, Paul B. *The Church and Mental Health*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1961.
- Muedeking, George H. *Emotional Problems and the Bible*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956.
- Nygren, Anders. *Agape and Eros*. Trans. Philip S. Watson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.

- Oates, Wayne E. *Religious Factors in Mental Illness*. New York: Association Press, 1955.
- Oden, Thomas C. *Kerygma and Counseling*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Outler, Albert C. *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Parker, Pierson. *The Gospel Before Mark*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Perrin, Norman. *Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Riddle, Donald W. *Jesus and the Pharisees*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- Roberts, David. *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Rogers, Carl R. *Counseling and Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
- _____. *On Becoming A Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*. Trans. Charles R. Joy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948. 1st German ed. 1913.
- Smith, C. W. F. *The Jesus of the Parables*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948.
- Szasz, Thomas S. *The Myth of Mental Illness*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Formation of Gospel Tradition*. London: Macmillan, 1953.
- Thornton, Edward E. *Theology and Pastoral Counseling*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Titus, Eric Lane. *Essentials of New Testament Study*. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.
- Tweedie, Donald F., Jr. *Logotherapy and the Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961.
- Ungersma, A. J. *The Search for Meaning*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Van Deusen, Dayton G. *Redemptive Counseling*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.

Wise, Carroll A. *Psychiatry and the Bible*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

PERIODICALS

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Problem of Miracles," in *Religion in Life*, XXVII (Winter, 1957-58), 63-75.

Day, E. "Jesus as A Mental Therapist," in *Open Court*, XXXVIII (December, 1924), 760-68.

Hall, Mary Harrington. "A Conversation with Viktor Frankl of Vienna," in *Psychology Today*, I:9 (February, 1968), 57-63.

Frankl, Viktor E. "The Will to Meaning," in *Journal of Pastoral Care*, XII (1958), 82-88.

_____. "Logotherapy and the Challenge of Suffering," in *Pastoral Psychology*, XIII (1962), 25-28.

_____. "The Concept of Man in Psychotherapy," in *Pastoral Psychology*, VI (1955), 16-26.

_____. "Dynamics, Existence and Values," in *Journal of Existential Psychiatry*, II (1961), 5-16.

113206
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.